DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 467 200 JC 020 547

AUTHOR	Huffman, John N.
TITLE	Perceptions by Community College Adjunct Instructors: Factors That Hinder and Enhance Their Classroom Teaching and Actions That Can Address Those Factors.
PUB DATE	2000-00-00
NOTE	142p.; D.A. Dissertation, George Mason University.
PUB TYPE	Dissertations/Theses - Doctoral Dissertations (041) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Adjunct Faculty; *Collegiality; *Community Colleges; Faculty Development; Faculty Workload; Mentors; *Part Time Faculty; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Improvement; Two Year Colleges; Work Environment
IDENTIFIERS	Montgomery College MD; *Northern Virginia Community College

ABSTRACT

Community college adjunct instructors are an increasing percentage of the faculty. They also teach an increasing percentage of the curriculum. While some research in the adjunct arena has been performed, adjuncts typically do not enjoy an adequate amount of research. A 72-question, 266-item demographic and attitudinal survey was distributed to 1,835 adjunct instructors at all campuses of Montgomery Community College in Maryland, Northern Virginia Community College, and Southside Virginia Community College; 486 instructors responded, for a response rate of 26%. The study found that: (1) the levels of compensation and benefits that adjuncts receive did not adversely affect their classroom teaching; (2) adjuncts as a whole had more positive perceptions about their employment environment and competencies than is commonly portrayed; and (3) 25% of adjuncts have a desire to improve their community membership and professional skills via peer mentoring groups. The study recommends that colleges facilitate the establishment of peer-mentor gestalts, utilizing self- and student evaluations, exchanged classroom visits, and dialogue and communication with peers, for all faculty (part and full time) who wish to improve their craft. Appended are the field research instrument, correspondence samples, and a list of tables and subjects. (Contains 68 references and 57 tables.) (Author/EMH)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 467 200

PERCEPTIONS BY COMMUNITY COLLEGE ADJUNCT INSTRUCTORS: FACTORS THAT HINDER AND ENHANCE THEIR CLASSROOM TEACHING AND ACTIONS THAT CAN ADDRESS THOSE FACTORS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
■ Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J. Huffman
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
1

by
John N. Huffman
A Doctoral Project
Submitted to the
Graduate Faculty
of
George Mason University
in Partial Fulfillment of
the Requirements for the Degree
of
Doctor of Arts
Community College Education

Committee:

Don M. Boileau	Don M. Boileau, Ph.D., Director
Anne M. Kuhta	Anne M. Kuhta, Ph.D.
Gustavo A. Mellander	Gustavo A. Mellander, Ph.D.
Victoria N. Salmon	Victoria N. Salmon, D.A.
Gustavo A. Mellander	Gustavo A. Mellander, Ph.D. Director of the National Center for Community College Education

Date: March 20, 2000

Spring Semester, 2000
George Mason University
Fairfax, Virginia

JC020547

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

John Huffman, D.Arts
301-929-0000 wordoc@jhu.edu

May 8, 2000

Dear Colleagues and Researchers,

"Din of Inequities" was the title of this dissertation when I first began it. I had completed a pilot project done in one department of one college, and based on those findings I was sure I would find at large a seething mass of discontented adjuncts ready to storm the academy. Initially, mine was hardly the attitude of an unbiased researcher. You can imagine my surprise as the data began to come in from the eight metropolitan Washington, D.C.-area and three rural Virginia community college campuses. With tongue in cheek, I had to amend the working title to "Din of Inequities?. . . Well, Maybe."

As you shall see, the survey's 72 questions generated 57 tables of data which indicate that a large majority of adjuncts like their jobs, their students, and their employers, and are not particularly exercised about their compensation. If you would like to get a quick bird's eye view, give a look at the List of Tables and Subjects - Appendix E, (p. 124).

In my efforts to paint a portrait of the community college adjunct instructor I relied upon many people in my field research. Thank you all for your vital contributions.

The attached dissertation is an exact duplicate of the one in the George Mason University Library in Fairfax, VA. If you have questions or comments, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

John Huffman

11440 Connecticut Avenue Kensington, MD 20895

Perceptions by Community College Adjunct Instructors: Factors That Hinder and Enhance Their Classroom Teaching and Actions That Can Address Those Factors

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Arts at George Mason University

By

John N. Huffman
Master of Science in Education
Johns Hopkins University, 1993

Director: Don M. Boileau, Professor
Communication Department

Spring Semester, 2000
George Mason University
Fairfax, Virginia

Copyright 2000 John N. Huffman
All Rights Reserved

Dedication

This project is dedicated to Kirsten Shumway, who exemplifies the steady, competent, courteous, and creative servant of the community, and my daughter Erika, who has launched her academic career at the University of Rothskilde in Copenhagen.

Acknowledgements

I gratefully acknowledge the following for their support in completing this project and the other requirements for the degree:

Dr. Don Boileau, for constant and friendly mentoring;
Dr. Gil Coleman, for his gentle persuasiveness;
Dr. Irene Fraser, for her fine tuning;
Jane Kreager, for her superlative editing;
Drs. Mellander and Salmon for their guidance and patience;
Dr. Anne M. Kuhta, for her sustaining support;
Dr. David W. Leslie, for his expert guidance;
My family, for their encouragement in many forms.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Abstract vii

1. Introduction
   Background of the Study 1
   Conclusion 7

2. Literature Review
   Review of Literature. 9
   Problem Statement 22
   Research Questions 24

3. Research Design
   Research Pilot 25
   Research Design: Procedures, Population, Instrument, Data Collection and Treatment, Prime Issues, Implications . . 26

4. Survey Questions, Data Tables, Results, and Discussion 30
   A Nature of Employment and Demographics 31
   B Peers, the Chair, and the Community 53
   C Evaluation and Professional Development 62
   D Students and the Classroom 75
   E Potpourri 83
   F Finale 93

5. Questions and Comments, Recommendation, Limitations, and Conclusion 96

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Appendix A - Cover Letters from College Presidents 113

Appendix B - Cover Letter from Researcher 116

Appendix C - George Mason University Permission to Conduct Research 117

Appendix D - The Field Research Instrument 118

Appendix E - List of Tables and Subjects 124

Works Cited - 127

Curriculum Vitae 132

ABSTRACT

PERCEPTIONS BY COMMUNITY COLLEGE ADJUNCT INSTRUCTORS OF FACTORS THAT HINDER AND ENHANCE THEIR CLASSROOM TEACHING AND ACTIONS THAT CAN ADDRESS THOSE FACTORS

John N. Huffman, D.A.
George Mason University, 2000
Project Director: Dr. Don M. Boileau

Community college adjunct instructors comprise increasing percentages of faculties, and teach increasing percentages of the curricula. Due to budget constraints imposed by administrators, legislatures, and national education needs, increasing numbers of a wide variety of students, shifting public attitudes, and reluctance of taxpayers and funding bodies to substantially increase higher education funds, there is little reason to believe the percentages will not continue to increase. While some research of the adjunct arena has been performed (e.g., Gappa and Leslie, and Roueche, et al), adjuncts do not enjoy an adequate amount of research. Little of what research has been performed directly identifies the attitudes and opinions of adjuncts themselves over a wide range of issues. This study utilized a 72-question, broad-spectrumed demographic and attitudinal survey, to which 486 adjunct instructors on 8 campuses at two community colleges in suburban Washington, D.C. and 3 campuses at a rural Virginia community college responded. The study concludes that: 1) the levels of compensation and benefits that adjuncts receive do not adversely affect their classroom teaching, 2) adjuncts as a whole have more positive perceptions about their employment environment and competencies than is commonly portrayed, and 3) 25 percent of adjuncts have a desire to improve their community membership and professional skills via peer mentoring groups. Utilizing self- and student evaluations, exchanged classroom visits, and dialogue and communication with peers, it is recommended that colleges facilitate the establishment of peer mentor gestalts for all faculty (part- and full-time) who wish to improve their craft.

adjunct *n.* **1:** something joined or added to another thing but not essentially a part of it
Webster's New International Dictionary

"I am an invisible man . . . I am invisible, understand, simply because people refuse to see me . . . ."
Ralph Ellison, in the Prologue of *The Invisible Man.*

"In sum, part-time faculty are a critical mass in American community colleges (p. 40) . . . Part-time faculty are sleeping giants; their sheer numbers and their impact on college instruction cannot and should not be ignored . . . The issues will be addressed, or they will maim higher education."
(Strangers in Their Own Land, Rouche, Rouche and Milliron, p. 157).

I. INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

The purpose of the American community college has always been singular - to provide to the community it serves, and the higher-education and vocational student it teaches, an effective pedagogical package. The delivery of that education rests with the classroom instructor. Thus, the teacher in the classroom helping students learn is the sine qua non of community college education. Nationally, adjuncts typically constitute sixty-eight percent of large community college faculties and teach forty percent of the courses (Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron, 1995, p. 28). Those two elements - the high percentage of faculties that adjuncts constitute and the substantial percentage of courses that adjuncts teach - have been growing ever larger for decades; no one doubts both will continue to grow.

Since teaching is the central function of the community college and adjuncts are and will continue to constitute well over half of the faculty, it is clear that the abilty of community colleges to fulfill their function largely function largely hinges on the calibre of the adjunct faculty. The quality of these faculty, in turn, will depend on the community colleges' capacity to attract and retain competent and satisfied adjuncts.

The Economic and Political Environment of Community Colleges and Adjuncts

The leading researcher in the Dept. of Education, Clifford Adelman, observed "With nary an acknowledgment from anybody, the community college has recently been moved to center stage in American education. Under (President Clinton's) vision to expand the universality of education from kindergarten through 'grade 14,' the role of this unique institution will change . . . (it) may make the difference whether we get from here - to there" (Adelman, 1997, p. A19).

While community colleges will continue to *grow* in the immediate future, their willingness to *change* is in doubt in the eyes of George A. Baker III, a professor of higher education who teaches community college leadership at North Carolina State University. At the 1998 annual convention of the American Association of Community Colleges he said that "Community colleges have become curiously inflexible institutions . . . The only change we are comfortable with is growth" (Schmidt, 1998, A38).

According to a 1998 WICHE/College Board report (as cited by Adelman, 1999), the number of graduating high school students will increase by 500,000 in this decade, which will translate into a 23 percent increase in just-graduated high school students who will attend community colleges (p. 23). That increase does not assume at least moderately probable additional factors such as fewer delayed entry students, successful college preparation programs for disadvantaged students, improvement in student retention figures, increased nümbers of older first-time postsecondary students, multi-faceted shifts in the labor market, and expansion of federal tax credit and grant programs.

As well, the needs of these students are likely to grow more complex. Adelman (1999), in writing about the capacity of higher education to meet the present and near-future "demands" of students, lists three crosscurrents - "emerging trends" - that postsecondary institutions must deal with.

The first crosscurrent is the increasingly broad array of non-credit programs (including basic education and contract training) offered by two-year colleges and, at the university level, continuing education and . . . certification programs. The second crosscurrent (allied to the first) is the increasing frequency of the occasional student who enrolls for knowledge upgrading and employment-related skills as a member of the labor force. The third is the changing pattern of attendance - the continued shift from the "traditional-age" student who finished his or her education by age 30 while attending just two institutions to the student who attends any number of institutions during his or her career path.

Adelman notes that community colleges figure in every one of the crosscurrents. He gives four reasons: 1) state policy-makers want to shift the "problem" of remedial education to the two-year sector; 2) the fast-growing and younger Latino population "prefers" the community college environment; 3) English-as-a-second-language (ESL) students constitute an increasing percentage of the general population and ESL courses are provided primarily by community colleges; and 4) community colleges "provide flexible and porous boundaries for both high school students and corporate education programs. Neither the four-year sector nor the proprietary schools are faced with these crosscurrents" (p.22).

Adelman (1997) says that data from the National Center for Education Statistics "demonstrate the centrality of the community college in a pattern of educational consumerism that is both healthy for society and sheer hell for higher education planning" (p. A-19). Two of the more "hellish" factors that college administrators face in responding to increased demand are space/time capacities - classroom space and class time slots. Many colleges have the space time capacities, but have difficulty finding faculty to teach in those time slots. Most full-time faculty have little desire for early morning or late afternoon classes, let alone late evening and weekend classes.

With all of these emerging and shifting vagaries, the adjunct instructor is number one on the list of solutions for administrators under current and foreseeable funding and budget realities. Hard economic realities have meant that administrators are taking increased control of hiring and curricular matters, particularly by eliminating vacated full-time faculty positions and hiring low-paid part-time instructors - some feel at the expense of "deep, rigorous learning" (Paglia, 1998, p. 8).

At the root of funding realities is a "fiscally conservative political climate at local, state and federal levels" that is forcing colleges to become more consumer-oriented, flexible, and accountable (Schmidt, 1998, p. A-38). For much of the '90's, higher education's financial resources and public esteem have fallen. Indeed, for many two-year colleges the result has been reduced budgets, eliminated full-time positions, and therefore an ever-increasing reliance on part-time faculty.

America's taxpayers and legislatures have demonstrated a change in their priorities in the past 20 years. In 1979 state tax funds for operating expenses in higher education were $11.22 per $1,000 of personal income; in 1997 it was $7.65 (Nespoli, 1998).

From the mid-1980's to the mid-1990's state government expenditures on higher education decreased by 18 percent while expenditures on prisons increased by 30 percent, according to *The Washington Post*. At about the same time, the number of prisoners tripled and the number of higher education students increased by 22 percent. In 1995 state building funds for higher education decreased by approximately $900 million, while spending on prison construction increased by about the same amount (Suro, 1997). Punishment has eclipsed higher education as a contender for state funds. Few, if any, would argue that adjuncts enjoy any priority in the hierarchy of annual budgeting. This reality is echoed by the Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession: Academic Salaries Since the Early 1970's, published in *Academe* (March/April 1999). While full-timers in two-year colleges (Category III) are frequently contained in the tables, there is no mention of part-timers.

While states are decreasing the share of state monies allotted to higher education, they are increasing pressure on colleges to prove their performance. As reported by Burke (1999), a 1999 Rockefeller Institute survey found that 30 states "either have added or are considering adding performance as part of the budgeting process . . ." (p. 17). The philosophy of this paradigm shift is that instead of measuring colleges on quantity of campus resources and quality of admitted students they should be evaluated on performance. Since adjuncts comprise nearly two-thirds of community college faculties and teach close to one-half of the courses, adjuncts are part of the budget solution and should figure prominently in addressing performance outcomes.

Academic Theories and Premises about Adjuncts

The terms "Roads Scholar" and "Beltway Bandit" are often heard as (perhaps) light-hearted descriptors of adjuncts. In more serious tones the titles of the recent and frequently cited works "The Invisible Faculty" (1993, Gappa and Leslie), "Strangers In Their Own Land" (1995, Roueche, Roueche and Milliron), and "Will Teach For Food" (1997, Nelson) speak to the plight of adjuncts. Cohen and Brawer (1996) say that "[p]art-time instructors are to the community colleges as migrant workers are to the farms" (p. 85). The more detailed plaints and recommendations of these authors are reported in the following Literature Review chapter. Gary Trudeau's "Doonesbury" makes a similar point: One cartoon has a boss in the back of a pick-up truck with megaphone in hand asking a job-seeker in a gaggle of unhappy and underclass adjunct and TA applicants what her requirements were. She responds, "A living wage, and to be treated like a human being," followed quickly by "Okay, okay, forget the human being part."

Such are the literary and comic images that seemingly many adjuncts, authors, and others have of part-time instructors. It is seldom, if ever, that one hears or reads otherwise - that the reality of most adjuncts might be the opposite of how they are portrayed. So, unopposed, the above sources are seen as valid depictions of the typical adjunct.

Empirical Evidence: A Pilot

As a believer of those depictions, this researcher accepted a widely circulated invitation from Clarice Somersall, the new Chair of the Reading, ESL, Foreign Languages, and Philosophy Department Montgomery College's Rockville campus, to attend a faculty focus group on improving channels of communication between part- and full-timers. As both a doctoral student in communication under the aegis of the National Center for Community College Education (NCCCE) and an adjunct instructor in communication and ESL in graduate and undergraduate courses at George Mason University, and as an adjunct at Montgomery College and Northern Virginia Community College I accepted the invitation. It seemed like fertile ground. During that first meeting Usha Venkatesh (a full-timer) and I were elected as co-chairs of what became a continuing committee. We named the committee the Faculty Integration Initiative (FII), and designed and distributed a 20-question survey to the department's 50 adjuncts. The response rate was 76 percent. Among the results were:

- 50 percent of the department adjuncts had been at Montgomery College five semesters or less
- 83 percent thought they had no significant influence in departmental policy issues
- 80 percent felt that they were not at all or only a little part of the community
- 66 percent either did not answer or answered "it doesn't" when asked, "Does the department show its appreciation for your work?"
- 84 percent said they "would prefer a full-time position if it were available"

The FII survey results appeared to provide empirical confirmation of the descriptions and theories presented in the works mentioned above, and to confirm my own biases.

The circulation of the FII survey and some of its findings inspired the formation of an adjunct group on the Rockville campus, which held the inaugural (and it developed the only) meeting of The Association of Part-Time Faculty at Montgomery College (APFMC), to which Usha and this researcher were invited as observers. Officers were elected, an agenda established, and assertive action items agreed upon. Unionizing was discussed. The next week representatives of APFMC met with a dean, who reportedly did not take kindly to many of the raised issues. Soon thereafter the leaders resigned their offices. I gave thought to continuing the effort in a leadership role, but was (well-) advised to complete the doctorate first. The APFMC quickly withered away.

Armed with the FII study and the APFMC experience, I delivered a paper in November at the annual convention in Chicago of the Midwest Modern Language Association, *Adjuncts and Their Din of Inequities: Transforming Complaints Into Action and Results* (Huffman, 1997). Among the questions I asked were:

- Expendable," "disposable," and "gypsy" are frequently used to describe adjuncts. To what extent does servile describe us?
- The most pernicious aspect of the current adjunct employment model used by almost all administrators is the message it sends to America's youth - those students who are drawn to higher education teaching but who know that were they to do so they would most likely be limited to poverty wages. How can we best get the reality across to the American public that higher education is in peril?
- Are we adjuncts going to lie at anchor, and drift on tides not of our making? Or are we going to set sail?

The FII survey findings confirmed the literature and my own ideology, and needed only to be confirmed by broader doctoral field research.

Conclusion

Despite the crucial role that adjuncts play on the community college campus in particular and higher education in general, little is known about how they perceive their role and environment . Research and literature is largely from the perspective of administrators (e.g., *Strangers in Their Own Land, 1995,* by Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron). Given the critical role that adjuncts play in the nation's community colleges, which are experiencing changing student populations and major economic challenges, it is time to paint a more current, comprehensive, and detailed portrait of the typical adjunct - using data gained directly from the adjunct. Chapter Two (Literature Review) will document the paucity of knowledge about the adjunct instructor.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW, PROBLEM STATEMENT, AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

A. Literature Review

Despite the crucial and ubiquitous role that adjuncts play in the academy, there is scant research on them. Much of the substantial literature that does exist is a small and empathetic cluster that illuminates the adjunct with research and advocacy; however, much of the remainder of the literature is anecdotal, superficial, and demeaning in its attitude. The following three works fall into the former category.

The Growing Importance of Adjuncts in Higher Education, and the Environment That They Teach in

The Invisible Faculty: Improving the Status of Part-Timers in Higher Education by Gappa and Leslie (1993) is one of the most cited works. It has done as much or more than any of its predecessors to increase the general awareness of the adjunct arena in higher education at large.

Two of the more salient conclusions of Gappa and Leslie's research are that higher education in America has no system for using part-timers. Instead, there is a "wildly random collection of institutional and departmental practices . . . We likewise found a discomforting universality in the feelings of part-time faculty that somehow they were being exploited, and blatantly so" (xiii).

In their preface Gappa and Leslie ask a fundamental question: "How can institutions expect people of talent to contribute to quality educational programs when those same people are victims of medieval employment conditions?" (xi).

Gappa and Leslie's two main objectives were to describe all aspects of the current environment and trends, and then, based on those findings, to "delineate forty-three recommended practices for institutions to follow" to affect change (xiii). Their research included interviewing 240 part-timers, and 227 deans, chairs, administrators and CEO's at eighteen site institutions (two- and four-year colleges and universities) across the U.S., and then buttressing the interviews with analyses of written materials from each institution and statistical data from the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES). Gappa and Leslie's findings are of great interest.

First, adjuncts are motivated by the intrinsic values of teaching far more than is generally perceived, and their satisfaction perservers despite their low status in the two-tiered academy (44).

Second, the stereotypic view of adjuncts as "marginal, temporary employees with no past and no future" is grossly inaccurate and unfair. Adjuncts' backgrounds are quite diverse, and therefore they require a much broader array of recognition and salary and benefits options than they currently receive (63).

Third, both the adjunct and the colleges that they teach for operate under wide arrays of state laws, state board mandates, collective bargaining and union contracts, and judicial decisions, all of which exist in a funding environment of restricted budgets. This multi-faceted milieu effectively forces college administrations to employ ever greater percentages of adjuncts, and moreover often makes it difficult for them to be direct about the reasons for their policies and hiring practices (91).

Fourth, at the most fundamental level adjuncts and colleges both are the victims of "constantly inadequate state budget appropriations" and fiscal crises which result in "too much teaching to be done with too little money" (108).

Fifth, while some colleges actively pursue policies that improve the lot of adjuncts (motivated sometimes by "doing the right thing" and other times by desire to avoid the consequences of "failing to do the right thing"), many other colleges perpetuate the status quo and give little evidence of doing otherwise (178).

And sixth, adjuncts feel most like members of their academic community when they enjoy access to supervisors and they are given evidence by those supervisors that their teaching is appreciated. This appreciation can be expressed by a "clear statement of mission about how part-timers can and do contribute to academic quality of the college" (140). Also crucial are invitations to participate in department and institution decisions, and access to professional development opportunities.

Strangers in Their Own Land; Part-Time Faculty in American Community Colleges (Roueche, Roueche and Milliron, 1995) deals specifically with community college adjuncts. The book traces the historical outlines of adjuncts, including figures that show that some community college faculties in the 1920's were comprised of upwards of 90% part-timers, though those percentages were in the extreme (3). Early in the institutionalization of the American community college, many instructors were employed full-time in secondary education, which allowed for close articulation between high school and college curriculum; as a college grew it could expand and diversify its specialized courses.

By 1966 the national average of adjuncts stood at approximately 38 percent. By 1980 it had increased to between 50 and 60 percent, and by 1992 to 55 to 65 percent (about 145,000 part-timers and 74,000 full-timers, or a two-to-one ratio). Translated into full-time equivalent contact hours, adjuncts teach at least 40 percent of America's community college courses (3). Further, employment trends show that all levels of higher education are showing similar increases, that those trends are most pronounced in community colleges, and that the trends will continue, due in part to academic labor market factors and fiscal restraints.

The authors quote Gappa and Leslie's *Invisible Faculty*: "What started out to be a 'temporary solution' has become a 'permanent fix.'" This "fix" has as its major detriments "an ebbing away of time available to students outside of class," of the development of curricula, of the development of professional relationships, and of the development of professional skills and knowledge (4).

The Roueche book is based on their 1993 stratified random sampling survey of a variety of community college administrators that was employed to learn just how part-timers are utilized. The survey was performed nationally on a variety of the 1,083 members of the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC). Among the study's more salient results at large college(s) were: 1) part-timers represent 68.25 percent of all faculty teaching at AACC member institutions 2) part-timers teach 42.54 percent of all credit hours 3) the mean salary per course was $1,479 (33).

Less than 24 percent of the 1,083 colleges surveyed offered benefits to part-time faculty, and of those only three-quarters actually provided benefits, usually to less than five part-timers per instituion. A typical college district's expenses for a new, entry level full-time instructor was $38,225 for ten three-hour courses per year; for a part-timer to teach the same load cost $16,785, a savings of $21,440, or 56 percent (34). Based on these figures, a college that employs 100 part-timers instead of 100 full-timers "saves" $2,144,000.

When college CEO's were asked to rank the importance of seven elements of utilizing part-timers (selection/hiring, orientation, evaluation, recruitment, professional development, collegiality, and rentention), selection/hiring ranked first with a mean of 2.3, compared to the fifth and sixth ranking of professional development and collegiality with an average mean of 4.6. In other words, CEO's believed that hiring was twice as important as development and collegiality (36).

Although the authors cite many specific examples of colleges that have established programs that deal with the above issues, they offer no assessment or research on the effectiveness of the programs' impact on student learning. Roueche concludes with the thoughts that "Part-time faculty are sleeping giants; their sheer numbers and their impact on college instruction cannot and should not be ignored . . . the issues . . . will not go away . . . They will be addressed, or they will maim higher education" (157).

While most of Cary Nelson's *Will Teach For Food* (1997) deals with universities, many of the factors and dynamics in four-year schools and universities are present in two-year colleges. Barbara Ehrenreich, writing in the foreword, says that in shifting from full-time employees to temporary workers who enjoy no benefits in two-tier work structures, universities engage in "hyper-capitalism, bandit economy, (and) moral numbness," and teach students that "some lives are valued a lot more than others" (ix-xi).

In what may be an overarching description of the entire adjunct issue, Nelson states that "higher education as a whole has become structurally dependent on a pool of cheap labor to teach its lower-level courses" (5). All community college adjuncts, of course, teach lower-level courses, and many of them as adjuncts teach the same or similar courses at four-year institutions.

Other works complete the portrait of the typical adjunct's environment. As to the causes of the continued and substantial increase in the percentages of courses taught by adjuncts and their prevalence in all of higher education and particularly on community college campuses, the Sloan Conference on Part-Time and Adjunct Faculty (Sloan, 1998) concluded that "Undoubtedly, there is no one single, simple explanation . . ." (11). Among the factors reported or speculated upon are an abundance of job candidates with doctorates, the lifting of mandatory retirement ages, and financial stress due to the "leveling off of state support for higher education in the early 1990's," compounded by increasing enrollment (6, 7).

Boileau (1997), writing as a Communication Department chair and former adjunct, speaks of the hiring, caring for, and evaluation of adjuncts at George Mason University. While the "key focus" (p. 2) of Boileau's paper is the role of the department chair in managing a communication environment in which seventy percent of departmental courses are taught by adjuncts, he does describe the state of affairs largely created by GMU's looking upon adjuncts as a "cash cow" (p. 5). The university's heavy reliance upon adjuncts creates significant problems in 1) increased demands placed upon full-time faculty in governance, and 2) decreased ability to schedule classes based on student needs rather than instructor availability.

Boileau offers a taxonomy of adjuncts, which includes the "galloping" part-timer, who teaches at as many as five institutions. the "professional" (who has a full-time professional job), the "part-time adjunct" (who often has many roles in the near-by community and the "graduate student" (p. 7). As well, Boileau speaks of the assets the adjuncts bring to the institution, which include "certain expertise," new and creative approaches to teaching, impetus for new course development, and high values as good colleagues.

Two sources that deal indirectly but nonetheless cogently with adjuncts bear mentioning.

The adjunct employment arena is, of course, comprised of two basic elements, adjuncts, and those who form and carry out policy to administer them. David M. Gordon, in his *Fat and Mean; The Corporate Squeeze of Working Americans and the Myth of Managerial 'Down-sizing'* (1996), states that in most capitalist cultures "two types of labor-management systems reflect sharply contrasting approaches to managing workers and encouraging productive job performance" (63).

The first can be described as a more cooperative labor-management approach, which results in a "fair degree of employment security, positive wage incentives, often with substantial employee involvement and often with strong unions" (63).

The second is premised upon much more adversarial labor-management relations, including relatively little employment security, reliance on the threat of job dismissal as a goad to workers, minimal wage incentives, (and) sometimes weak unions . . . The United States tends more and more to represent the archetype of the latter system (63) . . . ."

Kevin D. Henson's *Just a Temp* (1996) deals with temporary workers in the market place at large, and many of the elements that he addresses can be applied to part-time higher education instructors. The "contingent work force" ("secondary," "peripheral," and "fringe" are other adjectives that he uses) in the U.S. has been expanding 10 percent faster than full-time employment. Temporary workers can be hired for lower wages, without the payroll expenses of . . .benefits . . . employers are creating contingent positions rather than full-time positions (4) . . . the language of cost containment and efficiency (5) . . . the lower tier (of the peripheral workers) act as a buffer to the core, absorbing economic fluctuations" (20). In the psycho-social realm, Henderson states that there are "ubiquitous myths that part-timers prefer temporary to full-time schedules, are secondary wage earners, or possess . . .characterological flaws . . . these myths are used to deny, obscure, or justify . . . lower wages" (47).

Henderson believes that social isolation, whether on coffee breaks or office social occasions, follow circumscribed social hierarchies, which results in a "loss of personal identity" (ix). Although some part-time employees indeed have established full-time jobs, "most preferred full-time work in the primary sector with permanency, predictable wages, internal advancement, and the provision of employer-sponsored benefits" (47).

Thus, both Gordon and Henderson set a stage for fundamental analysis of the adjunct environment.

The Literature of Benign Neglect

Gappa and Leslie (1993) say that "There is little basic scholarship on part-time faculty . . . While numerous articles and reports have appeared in the journals and the ERIC system, most are based on experiences of individuals or single institutions. Some present highly subjective polemical arguments" (4).

Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron (1995) reiterate the same view in their *Strangers in Their Own Land:* " . . . we still know relatively little about (part-time faculty) and what they can bring to a teaching and learning community. Moreover, the diversity of their backgrounds and the needs of the part-timers make it difficult to design solutions that will address their disparate needs (8)." They continue: "Lack of research and absence of hard data about part-timers and their teaching performance make even more curious the hand-wringing and nay-saying positions taken by legislative bodies, by college administrations, and by full-timers" (18). Roueche, et al conclude that "[t]he general literature has not produced any evidence of national trends; no trends have emerged from these studies that indicate how best to effect part-timers' successful integration into college communities" (38).

Examples of the ignoring of and ignorance of adjuncts abound. Anyone who is familiar with any of the basic raw numbers of adjuncts' essential role in higher education - that nationally they constitute upwards of two-thirds of faculties and teach about 40 percent of community college courses (and therefore account for forty percent of the tuition revenue stream) - might well expect that any of the following nine sources would do more than virtually ignore or make slight mention of adjuncts.

Fifteen years ago Earl Seidman, in his preface to *In the Words of the Faculty: Perspectives on Improving Teaching and Educational Quality in Community Colleges* (1985) stated that " . . . this book brings to the foreground . . . inequities in collegial relations, (and) interdependent issues in teaching . . . " (p. x). He continues: " . . . understanding the perspective of the individuals who work within an institution is essential if one is to comprehend how that institution operates . . . the meaning participants find in their experience affects the way they carry out their work. This study was designed to draw its understandings, its identification of major issues, and its recommendations from faculty made of their work."

Seidman continues: "Research is often conducted by people outside schools and colleges and designed to tell those inside how to do their jobs better; this study attempts to combine the outside perspective of the research with the inside perspective of the faculty whose description of their own experience and reflection on the meaning of that experience provide valuable insight into the problems with the college . . . the structure in which (faculty) work contributes significantly to their daily work experience" (xi). The following 292 pages describe an "in-depth phenomenological interviewing study" of seventy-six community college instructors.

Not one of them is a part-time instructor.

Further, the term "part-time" is used anecdotally in passing by two of the interviewees a total of six times. " . . . the pay for part-timers is much worse" and " . . . most of the (part-time) faculty . . . were not very conscientious. They generally had an attitude that it wasn't all that important to teach these courses" are two of the six (114).

In his concluding chapter - "Recommendations to Strengthen Teaching and Enhance Educational Effectiveness" - Seidman makes 15 wide-ranging and encompassing recommendations. In recommendation #2 he states: "In order to provide equitable educational opportunity for their students, administrators must develop an equitable working environment for their faculty" (277). In the final paragraph of the book Seidman states that "Faculty are at the core of the academic work force, and their status, morale, collegiality, and commitment to their work are critical to student learning. When we allow support for such a critical component of the enterprise to erode . . . we are compromising the future of higher education in America" (281). Seidman makes no mention of adjuncts, either directly or indirectly.

Four years later, *Community College Futures: From Rhetoric to Reality*, edited by Norris and Knowles, (1989) described itself on the cover as "a theoretically sound and eminently practical resource to guide community college leaders in planning now for the twenty-first century world!" The eleven contributors devote virtually no space to adjuncts.

Dennis McGrath and Martin B. Spear (1991) devote three sentences of their 185 page *The Academic Crisis of the Community College* to part-time faculty. They say that "[f]or administrators the issue of part-time staffing is primarily a matter of fiscal responsibility and administrative flexibility, secondarily matters of anticipated employee commitment or quality control. Except that part-timers teach only one or two courses per semester, they are from a formal managerial perspective identical to their full-time colleagues. Given adequate credentials and common course objective (sic), adjuncts can be expected to teach roughly as well, and at very significant savings to the the institutions" (35).

Roy W. Smith, in his "*Tomorrow's* (the italics are Mr. Smith's) Community College" (1995), limits his mention of adjuncts to one paragraph, which contains the following: "It is unfortunate that too many community colleges utilize far too many adjunct or part-time faculty. While adjuncts are very valuable to teach specialized courses in which they have expertise, an institution of higher education must have faculty who devote their careers to the institution - the backbone of the institution . . . (maintaining academic standards is a task) seldom taken on by adjuncts" (p. 38).

Managing Community and Junior Colleges: Perspectives for Next Century, edited by A.M. Hoffman and D.J. Julius in 1994, is, like Seidman's book, wide-ranging and (nearly) all-encompassing in its 19 chapters and 251 pages, covering nearly every salient, next-century perspective of community college education. Yet, part-time faculty are given only two paragraphs.

Chapter 18's authors C. Poth, H.L. Sterns, M.N. Sugarman and R.S. Veloz allow that " . . . the preponderance of part-time faculty members in community colleges may be a short-sighted solution to the problem of salaries and space." They suggest that community colleges "examine their propensity to hire part-time faculty members" and find ways "to prevent these individuals from feeling aliented from their institution. For example, part-time faculty members could be given office space and asked to participate in faculty governance" (234-5). No other mention is made of adjuncts.

Canadian literature is similar. For example, *Challenge and Opportunity: Canada's Community Colleges at the Crossroads*, a ten-chapter book edited by J.D. Dennison (1995) offers the following in its introduction: " . . . this book contains critical issues and challenges which community colleges will have to accommodate if they are to maintain their relevance in the future . . . it is necessary to analyze organizational culture . . . (to) understand the sources of institutional conflict and/or harmony . . . " (3). Mr. Dennison does go on to tell his reader that " . . . approximately 25,000 full-time and over 150,000 part-time personnel teach in the (community) college sector . . . " (3). No other mention is made of part-time or adjuct faculty, even though adjuncts outnumber full-time faculty by a 6:1 ratio.

In the same vein, but temporally and geographically closer to this research, is the April/May 1996 issue of the Community College Journal, the organ of the American Association of Community Colleges. The cover headlines the then just completed 76th Annual Convention, and its theme of "Beyond the Mirror: Reflecting on who we are and where we need to be . . . A special look at the things that affect us most." One sentence in the entire publication is devoted to part-timers. In the article "Leadership Challenges for 2000," by John E. Rouche (12), item number 6 in a 9-item list states "Colleges will continue to employ more part-time and adjunct faculty to maximize operational efficiency" (12).

In the same issue of that April/May 1996 *Community College Journal*, the results of a survey titled "Reflecting What Was and What Will Be" (page 44) are the results of a survey of mostly college administrators. Among the results, under the issue of "most important programmatic issue," was that "Keeping faculty up to date and adaptable" received zero votes, while "Using technology for teaching and learning" received all (100%) of the votes. Adjuncts were not mentioned.

Typical of the lack of attention comes even in the conferences themselves. In the last five issues (from the spring/summer of 1997 through the spring/summer of 1999) of *Events in Academe*, a semi-annual publication by the Chronicle of Higher Education that lists many of the academy's wide-ranging events in the United States, there are only two events that deal specifically with adjunct or part-time faculty, both in April of 1998 and both sponsored by adjunct-oriented organizations.

In the Chronicle's last two *Almanacs* (1998-1999 and 1999-2000), the only mention of adjuncts is in two tables of racial and ethnic groups, and "Trends in Faculty Employment," the latter of which shows that the ratio of full-time-to-part-time faculty in 1975 was 70% to 30%, and in 1995 it was 59% to 41%. This change of 11 percent in both directions is surely a major problem.

The above nine sources fairly represent the quantity and tenor of almost all the literature as it applies, or might apply, to adjuncts in the past twenty years. They are offered in detail as examples of, at best, the benign neglect, and at worst, the uncaring duplicitness with which adjuncts are viewed.

The middle ground between the two extremes of the adjunct literature spectrum does contain some substantial research, including Parsons (1980), Leslie, Kellums and Gunne (1982), and Biles and Tuckerman (1986), but nearly all of it is limited to policy research. Little research has been done on the perceptions and feelings of adjuncts.

Community and Programs for Adjuncts

Collegial atmosphere and programs (particularly those of professional development) are the yin and yang of professionalism. Referring to research done by the Carnegie Foundation, Davis (1997) lists four characteristics that institutions with a "strong sense of community" possess: 1)well defined governance procedures (5), 2) healthy relationships . . . between faculty and administration, 3) "(satisfying) social relationships among faculty," and 4) "collegial atmosphere on campus" (9).

Programs can take many shapes, and include recognition and professional development.

Citing a study of 283 community colleges in the Midwest, Erwin (1993) reports that only 13.2 percent of 250 responding schools had merit recognition programs for outstanding part-time faculty, while 60% had such programs for full-time faculty. Three elements of the "life of the college" are given - curriculum development, program coordination, and academic advisement (560), and Erwin feels that there "appears to be no systematic method of integrating part-time faculty members in the community" colleges (562).

As to institutional programs initiated by administrators that are intended to address the professional needs of adjuncts, Baker (1995) describes a comprehensive and long-term project initiated by the then new chancellor of Pima Community College in Arizona in 1990. A major issue of the institution-wide project was the 1,300-member adjunct faculty, 80 percent of whom responded to a survey. Among the issues focused upon in the Pima project were "compensation, professional development, and support" for part-time faculty (51).

Teams comprised of administrators, department chairs and part-time faculty comprised a task force chaired by the chancellor. The task force developed recommendations that were phased in by the governing board over a three-year period. Baker reports that Pima Community College adjunct faculty "now are highly competent and enjoy the highest compensation rate in the state, and almost all of the recommendations are fully implemented to the satisfaction of both department chairs and adjunct faculty" (51).

In Part Two ("Enhancing Education . . .") of their work Gappa and Leslie (1993) make 43 recommendations for administrators. Among them are: 1) regularly survey part-timers about their issues 2) give advice on part-time faculty policies via a campuswide representative body, 3) train department chairs on effective supervisory practices and make them accountable for implementing consistent part-time faculty employment policies and give them incentives to do so (they feel that the most critical component in change is the department chair) and 4) use veterean faculty to develop new faculty members' teaching skills by providing faculty mentors to inexperienced part-time faculty and conduct frequent workshops on good teaching practices.

The authors conclude with these thoughts: "Colleges improve their programs *because* they employ part-time faculty, not in spite of their part-time faculty" (277). The programs rest fundamentally on classroom competencies, financial rewards, and curriculum involvement.

The "most critical" goal of the Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron (1995) study was to "showcase successful part-time faculty utilization and integration programs" (38) at 30 varied community colleges within the context of the above-mentioned seven elements (selection/hiring, orientation, evaluation, recruitment, professional development, collegiality, and rentention),

Five of the larger Roueche thoughts and findings were: First, only three of the thirty colleges required a pre-hiring, "on-site demonstration of teaching ability" (57); second, policies for recruiting, selecting, and hiring part-time faculty have not been improved in the last decade (57); third, "most part-timers are not integrated into a college with a formal orientation experience" at most community colleges (79); fourth, in an "environment where growth and development and learning are so highly prized . . . learning is one-sided" and it occurs only on one side of the teacher's desk (81); fifth (allied with number four but not necessaryily the result) very little money is devoted to faculty development and it remains far down the list of budget items (83).

Summary of Literature

In reviewing the literature that deals directly with community college adjuncts it may be what is not said is more important than what is said. While there have been some in-depth studies of adjuncts, there is almost no direct research of the attitudes and opinions of adjucts themselves about many of the issues raised in this review.

B. Problem Statement

Ever since making its entrance into the higher education scene some 90 years ago, the American community college has relied upon two factors: innovative and timely responses to the ever-shifting education needs of the community it serves, and heavy reliance upon part-time (adjunct) faculty to teach its students.

In the past few years the vagaries of the community college arena seem to have increased in their number and scope. Among the many factors that the adjunct, his or her department chair(s), and college administrators are all impacted by and must deal with, either directly or indirectly, are diminishing state and local revenue streams, increasing competition from the for-profit sector, the shifting needs of its students as reflected by societal issues at large (e.g., technology and immigrant populations) and an increasing percentage of high school graduates who simply do not have the academic and social skills that are required to pursue post-secondary educational goals.

These and many other factors, singly and in concert, manifest themselves in three crucial areas of the adjunct's professional life:
1) compensation and benefits, 2) professional development, and 3) membership in the academic community. These factors work synergistically to significantly affect the adjunct's effectiveness in the classroom.

Gappa and Leslie's (1993) *The Invisible Faculty* and Roueche, Roueche and Lilliron's (1995) *Strangers in Their Own Land* explore the domain of the part-timer in most valuable ways. Nelson's (1997) *Will Teach for Food* gives penetrating insight into the financial and institutional challenges that adjuncts face. ERIC is certainly not lacking in its multi-faceted and longitudinal information, nor are the periodicals such as *Community College Education* and the *Community College Journal* in want of descriptions of problems and proffered solutions.

While Vaughan (1995) in his *The Community College Story - A Tale of American Innovation* does mention that adjuncts outnumber full-timers by a ratio of almost 2:1, he devotes barely four paragraphs to adjuncts (p. 21). And McGrath and Spear (1991) in *The Academic Crisis of the Community College* dispense with adjuncts on a single page (p. 35), which contains the thoughts "For administrators the issue of part-time staffing is primarily a matter of fiscal responsibility and administrative flexibility, secondarily matters of anticipated employee commitment or quality control" and " . . . adjuncts can be expected to teach roughly as well (as full-time faculty), and at very significant savings to the institutions."

But there is no wholistic view *of* the community college adjunct *in situ*, nor is there a view of the college campus as seen *by* the day-to-day, campus-to-campus, semester-to-semester, adjunct.

C. Research Questions

1. How do Washington,D.C.-area community college adjuncts feel about specific elements related to their 1) compensation and benefits, 2) membership in the academic community and 3) professional development?
2. To what extent do they believe that those elements hinder and enhance their classroom teaching?
3. What specific actions can be designed and implemented to lessen or enhance those factors?

Chapter Three describes (research design) the methods of generating, collecting, and treating the answers to these questions directly from adjuncts.

3. RESEARCH PILOT AND RESEARCH DESIGN

A. Research Pilot

This chapter describes this author's entry into the adjunct arena as an increasingly involved researcher, and the evolving of the research project.

In October of 1996, the chair of Reading, ESL, Foreign Languages and Philosophy Department at the Rockville Campus of Montgomery College in Maryland, circulated an announcement that invited part- and full-time faculty to a meeting to engage in " . . . dialogue about improving our channels of communication." The Faculty Integration Initiative (FII) was formed and two co-chairs were elected: one full-timer, Usha Venkatesh, and one part-timer, this researcher. Over the next year an adjunct survey was designed, 52 were mailed out, 30 were returned by mail (58% response rate) and analyzed, and recommendations were made by the co-chairs, which were modified and passed on to higher-ups by the department chair.

Among the more salient results of the survey was the sense of isolation that adjuncts feel. For example,

1. to the question "How much do you feel that you are part of the adjunct departmental community,?" 80% answered "a little" or "none."

2. an average of 78.3% felt they had no significant influence in policy issues" (at the) course, department and college level(s) . . . ."

3. to the question, "How does the department specifically show its appreciation of your work,?" 70% said "It doesn't" or did not respond.

4. more than 1/4 (28%) had been adjuncts for 2 semesters or less, and almost 1/2 (49%) had been adjuncts for five semesters or less.

The results of the FII study indicated a substantial "disconnect" between adjuncts and their department and community college (Maryland's largest), and verified that issues beyond salary and benefits were of real concern to them.

The FII pilot findings were part of a paper, *Adjuncts and Their Din of Inequities: Transforming Complaints Into Action and Results*, that was presented at the 1997 annual convention of the Mid-West Modern Language Association in Chicago (Huffman, 1997).

B. Research Design

The primary research instrument began as a relatively modest 20-question survey. My goal was to paint a portrait of adjuncts - not just the eyes, or the chin, but the whole body, which led to a seemingly endless addition of features of the portrait that could not be left out. How could I ask about health insurance and not ask about retirement plans? How could I ask about feelings of membership in the academic community and not ask how much they preferred to feel like a member? How could I ask about hopes of getting a full-time teaching position and not ask if they would take a full-time job on their campuses? Each subject raised a contiguous question, and, despite caveats from colleagues, inexorably the survey grew to a 72-question / 266 item instrument (Appendix D) that touched upon most aspects of a typical part-time instructor's teaching life. I had been afflicted with research greed, but knew that it would produce a complete portrait of a 1998 Washington, D.C.-area community college adjunct.

During the process, Dr. Gilbert Coleman of George Mason University and this researcher visited with Dr. David W. Leslie at William and Mary College (Williamsburg, VA) for expertise in the design of the instrument. Professor Leslie commented that the survey asked many questions that had not been asked before. It was approved for September distribution to all adjuncts (about 1,800) on all eight (suburban) campuses of Montgomery (community) College in Maryland and Northern Virginia Community College.

For purposes of contrast and comparison, in November the questionnaire was distributed to approximately 35 adjuncts on three campuses at Southside Virginia Community College (SVCC), which serves largely rural south-central Virginia . SVCC respondents sealed their completed questionnaires in envelopes to be collected by an SVCC administrator, who mailed them in bulk to the National Center for Community College Education (NCCCE).

Each distributed questionnaire had two cover letters. The first was from the president of the community college at which the adjunct taught, and recommended participation in the research (Appendices B1, B2, and B3). The second was from this researcher (Appendix B), and addressed, among other elements, the requirements of the Office of Sponsored Programs at GMU, which included the statements that returned questionnaires would be "solely under my control, and will remain anonymous and totally confidential" and that questions or comments could be directed to two of the project committee members (phone numbers were included). Distribution was via the adjuncts' mail boxes at the end of the first week of class of the Fall 1998 Semester at Montgomery College and NVCC, and the middle of November, 1998 at SVCC.

To increase the confidence in anonymity and consequent candor in answering the questions, respondents mailed the completed questionnaires directly to this researcher at the NCCCE at George Mason University via a postage pre-paid envelope that accompanied the questionnaire. The envelopes were delivered unopened to this researcher by NCCCE staff. Compilation and tabulation of the returned questionnaire data was done by the researcher.

The questionnaire was designed so that the answer to the last question ("List the three most important factors . . . that hinder and the three most important factors that enhance your teaching") would be the result of the respondents' having considered almost every aspect of their teaching, and therefore, with comprehensiveness, would list the specific factors that most hinder and enhance their teaching.

Prime Issues

Besides the gathering of demographic data, prime issues in this study are:

1. How often do adjuncts attend professional development sessions? How often are they offered? (survey questions 46, 47, 48).
2. How are adjuncts supervised? How often are they observed by peers or supervisors in the classroom and how often do they observe other instructors in their classrooms? Are there opportunities for peer mentoring? (36, 37, 52, 53)
3. How often are students given adjunct instructor evaluation forms, and how valuable are they to the adjunct? (42, 43, 44)
4. What opportunities are there for text selection and governance decisions? (50, 60, 61)
5. What are the turnover and "burnout" rates of adjuncts? (4 & 65)
6. What are the primary benefits and concerns of being an adjunct? (70, 71)
7. What incentives and recognition do they receive? (38)
8. How much do they feel like a member of the academic community? (34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 50, 66)
9. How much do they want to be a member of the academic community? (35, 40, 41, 45, 46, 47, 48)
10. How rooted are they with the college? (29, 32)
11. What percentage of adjuncts are hectic "roads scholars."? (6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 26, 55)
12. What percentages have no health insurance and want health insurance? (21, 23)

Implications

Due to the broad spectrum of the research instrument and its application directly to a wide variety of community college adjunct faculty, it was anticipated that the research would: 1) reveal previously unknown facets of the adjunct arena 2) be of help to department chairs, deans and administrators in program and policy development, and 3) lead to further direct research of adjuncts in higher education at large.

Most fundamentally, the research was designed to provide extensive information on how adjuncts feel about 1) sundry issues of their college employment and teaching, and 2) how those issues rank in the hindrance and enhancement of the adjuncts' teaching.

Chapter Four (Questions, Tables, Results, and Discussion) contains the adjuncts' answers to the 12 questions above (the synthesis of 37 survey questions), and to 35 other survey questions.

4. SURVEY QUESTIONS, TABLES, RESULTS, AND DISCUSSION

As mentioned, 486 respondents on ten campuses at three colleges returned the research instrument, which contained 72 questions with 266 items. The questions and the raw data generated by the questions have been collapsed into 55 tables, which are proximately followed by the results and the discussions of the tables (often citing corroborating or inconsistent literature). It was felt that the proximity and flow of these five elements (questions, data, tables, results and discussion) would facilitate a reader's journey through the adjuncts' environment. The questionnaire contained six categories:

A. nature of employment and demographics
B. peers, the chair, and the community
C. evaluation and professional development
D. students and the classroom
E. potpourri (miscellaneous issues)
F. finale (a ranking of elements that adjuncts see as hindering and enhancing their teaching)

This chapter follows the same sequence, though some questions have been moved and combined with questions in other categories.

To avoid page breaks that would fragment tables, and for other reasons of readability, blank spaces appear on some pages.

A. Demographics and Nature of Employment

Disciplines & Gender

Questions 1 & 12

1. In what primary discipline or program do you teach?
12. Male Female

Table 1
(Questions 1 & 12; *n = 486*)
Number of Male and Female Respondents
to the Survey and Primary Discipline Taught In

	Humanities	Non-Humanities	Totals
College A			
Females	74	34	108
Males	37	44	81
Totals	111	78	**189**
College B			
Females	75	54	129
Males	35	109	144
Totals	110	163	**273**
College C			
Females	6	8	14
Males	2	8	10
Totals	8	16	**24**
Colleges **A/B/C**			
Females (51.6%)	155 (67.7%)	96 (37.4%)	251
Males (48.4%)	74 (32.3%)	161 (62.6%)	235
Totals	**229 (47.1%)**	**257 (52.9%)**	**486**

Results and Discussion

For data managibility, "primary discipline(s)" were assigned to either the humanities (languages, literature, history, mathematics, art, and philosophy) or non-humanities (all other courses). Adjuncts teaching adult education and other non-institutional credit classes were not surveyed.

The percentages of female (51.6) and male (48.4) respondents compares to Northern Virginia Community College (College **B**) Office of Institutional Research Fact Book's (1998) figures of 43.4 and 55.7 respectively (p. 4-5). (Montgomery College - College **A** - does not publish resources equivalent to NVCC's Fact Book.) Thus, it would appear that females responded to the survey approximately 8 percent more and males 7 percent less than their actual percentages on the part-time faculty for NVCC alone.

The distribution of the respondents is similar to other research of adjuncts in higher education. For example, as quoted by Burns (1992), U.S. Department of Education (1988) statistics show that females constitute 67.1 percent of those who teach part-time in the humanities in four-year institutions, compared to the 67.7 percent in this study. The Chronicle of Higher Education (1998) reports statistics which show that 46.7 percent of part-timers in colleges and universities are female, compared to this study's 51.6 percent.

Average Hours Taught for Various Semesters and Prep Time for Each Class

Questions 2, 8 & 55

2. How many semester hours are you teaching this semester at (this campus)? ____ All (of this c.c.'s campuses)? ____ All institutions? ____
8. From fall '97 through the spring '98 at all institutions, how many total semester hours did you teach?
55. How many hours per week outside of class do you typically devote to each course you teach?

Table 2

(Question 2)

Average Hours Taught At All Instituions Fall '98 Semester: Gender, Discipline, and College

	Humanities	Non-Humanities
College **A**		
Females	5.7	5.7
Males	4.8	4.7
College **B**		
Females	6.6	5.0
Males	5.5	4.4

Table 3

(Question 2)

Total Instructional Hours At All Institutions
Fall '98 and Average Number of Hours Taught

	Semester Hours Taught By Adjuncts	Number of Adjuncts	Average Hours Taught
College **A**	917	186	4.93
College **B**	1,431	272	5.26
A/B	2,348	458	**5.13**

Table 4

(Question 8; *n = 438*)

Total Hours Taught Fall '97
and Spring '98 Semesters

College	A	B	C	A/B/C
Aver. Total Number Hours Taught in Fall and Spring of '97-'98	13.1	12.0	16.1	**12.6***

* Note that this figure divided by two produces the average per fall and spring semesters of 6.3.

Table 5

(Question 55; *n = 476*)

Number of Preparation Hours Per Course Per Week

A	B	C	A/B/C
5.38	4.70	4.30	**4.94**

Results and Discussion

None of the three colleges publishes data that pertain to questions 2, 8 or 55. No significant differences were seen between males and females or humanities and non-humanities. Differences between campuses ranged from 4.3 for campus B5 and 6.3 for campus A1.

According to the AAUP's "Working for Academic Renewal" (1998), the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) reports that the typical higher-ed part-timer in public two-year institutions in 1992-93 taught 7.4 hours and invested another 5.6 hours out of the classroom for a total of 13 hours per class (Table 5), which compares with this study's 6.3 (Table 4) and 4.94 (Table 5) for a total of 11.3. The average ratio of class-time to prep-time for this and the NCES study is approximately 1.3-to-1.

The prep time numbers are probably higher for the humanities particu-(larly English), as reflected by Kroll's study (1994) which shows that for every 5.5 hours of class presentations English instructors spent another 5.5 hours in preparation, compared to this study's 4.94 for each course, or a 1-to-1 ratio.

Almost no differences were seen in the raw data between males and females or humanities and non-humanities. However, there were significant differences between campuses; for example, respondents at campus 1 of College A spent 6.3 hours on class prep time, and at campus 5 at College B it was 4.3 hours.

Table 6
(Question 8; *n = 438*)
Adjuncts Who Taught 24 or More Total Hours
for Fall '97 and Spring '98 Semesters

Colleges	A	B	C	A/B/C
Aver. Total Hours of Adjuncts Who Taught 24+ Hours Fall and Spring of '97-'98,	30.2	35.2	29.4	**32.3**
Percentage of Respondents Who Taught 24+ Hours	14%	8.5%	20.8%	**8.8%**

Results and Discussion

Table 6 describes the "roads scholar." The 32.3 converts to almost eleven 3-credit classes, which when calculated Table 5's almost 5 hours of preparation time per class, means that these "32.3" adjuncts are working 31+ hours per week for 32 weeks per year (almost 1,000 hours) for an annual income of approximately $16,500 ($500 per credit hour), or less than $17 per hour, before taxes and without benefits. This data is not inconsistent with Table 11, which shows that 28 percent of the respondents teach at two, three or four institutions (not campuses). When Table 6 is combined with Table 20 (commuting time) it is probable that the "32.3-hours" adjunct spends an additional 14 hours commuting.

Ideal Number of Hours

Question 3

Ideally, how many hours would you like to teach as a part-timer (on your campus)?

Table 7
(Question 3; *n = 218*)

Percentages Who Teach Ideal, Too Few, and Too Many Hours

Percent Who Teach Within the Range of Their Ideal Number of Hours	61%
Percent Who Teach Too Many Hours and Average of Excess Hours	4% / 3.0 hours
Percent Who Teach Too Few Hours and Average of Insufficient Hours	35% / 3.2 hours

Results and Discussion

Roughly two-thirds of the respondents teach within their preferred range of hours. More than one-third felt that they teach too few hours - the equivalent of one course - which may indicate a more-than-adequate pool of adjuncts for hiring entitities to draw from. Only 9 of the 218 respondents (approximately 4 percent) teach more hours than they would like to - again, the equivalent of one course.

Processing the data revealed no significant differences between males/females, the schools A/B, or the disciplines. The data is for the single largest campus at Colleges A and B. Adjuncts who gave figures that reflect their desire for full-time jobs were excluded.

Semesters and Years Taught at the Community College

Questions 4 & 11

4. Including this current fall semester of '98, how many semesters have you taught at (your) C.C. (all campuses)?

11. Since you first began teaching in post-secondary education, how many years have you taught as an adjunct (all institutions)?

Table 8

(Questions 4 & 11; *n = 476*)

Number of Semesters Taught At This Institution

	Number of Instructors	Total # of Semesters	Aver. Number of Semesters
College A			
Females	103	1,082	10.5
Males	81	1,112	13.7
College B			
Females	121	1,453	12.0
Males	148	2,686	18.1
College C			
Females	13	96	7.4
Males	10	99	9.9
A/B/C			
Females	237	2,631	11.1
Males	239	3,897	16.3
Totals	**476**	**6,528**	**13.7**

Table 9
(Questions 1, 4, and 12; *n = 484*)
Years Taught, Discipline and Sex

	Humanities	Non-Humanities	Female	Male
College A	7.57	9.01	8.52	8.77
College B	8.19	8.34	7.06	9.36
College C	7.86	4.69	4.54	7.10
A/B/C	**7.71**	**7.88**	**7.29**	**8.77**

Aggregate: **8.02**

Results and Discussion

In Tables 8 and 9, in all comparisons but one of males with females and non-humanities with humanities, males and non-humanities had the higher averages (the one exception was humanities and non-humanities in College C). Given that more than half (55%) of the respondents did not teach in the summer of of 1998 (see question #5), the data in these two tables correlate well. For example, males at College B have taught an average of 18+ semesters over the preceding 9.36 years.

These tables fly in the face of the " . . . generalized concern that part-time faculty, no matter how qualified, competent, or conscientious in performing their duties, lack the permanent commitment required for sustained teaching effectiveness . . . ." (Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron, 1995, p. 9). The numbers do indeed indicate long-term commitment.

Kroll's (1994) citation of figures of part-timers in the humanities in New York State had only 41 percent that had taught four or more years, which contrasts strongly with the above data, as does the NSOPF figure of only 32% having taught for 7+ years (Gappa and Leslie, 1993, p. 35). But given the similarity of the three college's numbers, it seems likely that the statistics are valid.

Clearly, any adjunct (e.g., the typical adjunct at the three colleges in this study) who invests 13.7 semesters (Table 8) over 8.2 years (Table

9) cannot be described as "lack(ing) in permanent commitment".

"For many part-time and evening students, part-time faculty *are* the college " (Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron, 1995, p. 9). Indeed. And it would seem that for chairs, deans, provosts and presidents, part-time faculty *are* the college (italics not this author's).

Part of Day Taught In

Question 5

(On your campus) do you teach primarily in the
mornings *afternoons* *evenings* *weekends ?*

Table 10
(Question 5; *n = 455*)
Time of Day Taught In

Mornings	Afternoons	Evenings	Mix	Weekends
15%	6%	54%	20%	5%

Results and Discussion

Almost sixty percent of the respondents teach only in the evenings or on weekends. Another unknown percentage can be added to that figure, as part of the "mix" category are in the evening / weekend category. The ranking of the percentages probably is a function in part of the preferences of full-timers, and that a sizeable percentage of the respondents have full-time jobs.

Number of Campuses and Institutions Taught At

Questions 10 & 6

6. How many other institutions (other than this c.c.) are you teaching at this Fall '98 semester?
10. During the past academic year, at how many campuses (all institutions) did you teach?

Table 11

(Question 6; *n = 471*)

Percentages of Respondents at Colleges A, B, and C Who Teach at 1, 2, 3, or 4 Institutions for Fall '98

No. of Institutions	1	2	3	4
Percentages	72	23	4	.06

Table 12

(Question 10; *n = 423*)

Percentages Who Taught at 1, 2, 3, or 4 or More Campuses During the Past Academic Year

No. of Campuses	1	2	3	4+
Percentages	67	22	7	4

Results and Discussion

New instructors (those with less than 1 year), were not included in the computations. For question 10, the percentages for colleges A and B were nearly identical; for college C, they were similar - 57, 29, 10, and 5. A perhaps not insignificant number of respondents may teach full-time in secondary or higher education and have included those full-time campuses in their answers. The reason(s) for the increased percentages for the Fall '98 semester (Table 4) compared to the past academic year (Table 11) is unknown.

The figures show that one-third of the respondents teach at two or more institutions. An unknown portion of those teach full-time at the secondary and higher-ed levels.

Hours Taught Summer '98

Question 9

For the summer of '98 how many semester hours did you teach (all institutions)?

Table 13
(Question 9; *n = 209*)
Average Hours Taught in Summer, '98

A	B	C	A/B/C
5.0	5. 2	3.6	**5.1**

Table 14
(Questions 8 & 9; *n = 244*)
Percentages Who Taught in Fall and/or Spring Semester '97-98 But Who Did Not Teach Summer '98

A	B	C	A/B/C
57	53	67	**55**

Results and Discussion

Slightly less than half of the respondents who taught in either or both of the preceding two semesters taught close to the equivalent of two three-hour courses during the summer of '98. Or, restated, more than half of the respondents were motivated by reasons unknown to teach in the summer.

Race

Question 13

a. *African-American* b. *Asian* c. *Hispanic* d. *White* e. _________

Table 15
(Question 13; *n = 435*)
Percentages of Racial Minorities (all but White)

A	B	C	A/B/C
14.9	5.0	43.7	**9.2**

Results and Discussion

Hemenway's (1988) 11 percent at College A (Montgomery College) compares with this study's 14.9.

Roueche, Roueche and Milliron (1995) say that part-timers represent "racial minorities in a slightly lower percentage than full-timers (9.2 percent) (p. 6). Cohen and Brawer (1996), citing 1994 NCES statistics, show that nationally non-whites comprised 14.5 percent of full-time faculty in two-year institutions (p. 76). Gappa (1984), cites Tuckman's 1978 study that reported 8.3 percent as non-caucasian (p. 30).

Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron (1995) say that, compared to full-time faculties, "part-time faculty pools, in general, tend to be less diverse and represent more of a problem than an opportunity for affirmative action" (p. 14).

(Three of the five campuses of College B had an average of 2.3% for minorities for those campus respondents. Location of the campuses may well be a determining factor.)

Using figures from the U.S. Department of Education, The Chronicle of Higher Education (1998) reports that 12.9 percent of full-time faculty in America's colleges and universities are non-causasian. compared to part-time faculty's 12.0 percent. Thus, this study's sample represents less than the national averages.

Age

Question 14

Age: __

Table 16
(Question 14; *n = 463*)
Average Age

A	B	C	A/B/C
52.9	49.6	42.9	**49.3**

Results and Discussion

The 49.3 respondent average age compares to Northern Virginia Community College (1998) Fact Book's median age of 48.

The typical respondent in this study (at 49.3 years old) falls into the 31.9 percent of part-timers who are in the 45-59 years-old category according to data abstracted from 1988 NSOPF data for higher-ed part-timers by Gappa and Leslie (1993, p. 20). Another 51.9 percent (two-thirds again as many) are in the 30-44 category. The numbers are roughly reversed when applied to full-timers. The impression is one in keeping with the oft repeated statement that many in higher education are near to retirement and that a new generation is waiting in the wings, although the data is 10 years old.

According to Blackburn and Lawrence (1995), in 1988 approximately one-third of all higher-ed faculty were in each of the 36-45 and 46-55 years-old categories, and "forecasters disagree sharply on the maginitude and timing" of faculty shortages (p. 33). The dropping of the 70-years-old limit on tenure may well be a factor.

Marital Status

Question 15

Single Married Separated

Table 17

(Question 15; *n = 481*)

Percentages of Single, Married, and Separated Adjuncts

A			B			C			A/B/C		
si.	mar.	sep.	si.	mar.	sep.	si.	mar.	sep.	si.	mar.	sep.
27	68	5	20	76	4	26	74	0	**23**	**73**	**4**

Results and Discussion

The 73 percent of respondents who are married (and not separated) compares with NSOPF percentages of part-timers who are married cited by Gappa and Leslie (1993, p. 26) of 78 percent of men and 71 percent of women. Those NSOPF percentages contrast with those of full-timers, of whom 78 percent of the men and 63 percent of the women are married.

Academic Degrees

Questions 17 & 18

17. What is the highest degree that you hold? (circle one):

a. High School Diploma	*b*. Associate's Degree
c. Bachelor's Degree	*d*. Master's Degree
e. Master's+ _____ hours	*f*. Doctorate

18. Are you currently enrolled in a program of study (p.o.g.)?

Table 18

(Questions 17 & 18; *n = 479*)

Percentages Who Hold Various Degrees
and Are Enrolled in Program of Study (p.o.g.)

	HS	AD	BA	Mast	Mast+	Doc	p.o.g.
College A	0	0	5.3	46.2	23.1	25.2	9.1
College B	0.1	0	9.6	42.4	26.0	21.2	14.9
College C	4.0	8.3	12.5	37.5	29.2	8.3	17.0
A/B/C	<1.0	<0.1	8.1	43.6	25.0	22.0	12.7

Results and Discussion

The percentages of the respondents' contrast to NVCC's Fact Book, which shows 50 percent of temporary faculty holding a master's (vs. this study's 69 percent) and 14 percent holding a doctorate (vs. 22 percent). It would appear then that the respondents were skewed to being females (see Table 1) holding doctorates.

Kroll (1994) cites a study of 351 part-time faculty at public and private institutions within the Council of North Central Two-Year Colleges (CNCTYC). That study's bachelor's degree holders totalled 17% (contrasted to the respondents' 8.1), master's at 65% (compared to 68.6), and doctorates at 4% (contrasted to 22.0).

The contrasts to Colleges A and B and similarity to College C most likely are due to college A and B's proximity to a very large and highly educated population that would be expected in a nation's capitol. Indeed, percentages similar to full-time community college faculties are cited by Cohen and Brawer (1996), which show percentages of master's holders in the low 60's and doctorates at 20+ (p. 79), as well as an increasing percentage of doctorate holders over the past six decades.

Health Plans / Insurance

Questions 21, 22 & 23

21. Are you covered by any health insurance plan? *yes no*

22. Who provides the plan? *another job* *individual policy* *spouse's employer* *other*

23. If unsubsidized health insurance were available at (your c.c.), would you pay to participate? *yes no*

Table 19

(Questions 21, 22, & 23; *n = 484*)

Percentages and Numbers Who Are Insured/Uninsured and Who Have Interest in Unsubsidized Insurance

	A	B	C
Percentage That is Covered by Health Insurance	96%	95%	79%
Number of Uninsured Who Have Interest in C.C. Unsubsidized Insurance	3	7	2
Percentage of Insured That Hold Individual Policies	10%	7%	8%
Number of Individually Insured Who Have Interest in C.C. Unsubsidized Insur.	12	13	0

Results and Discussion

That almost all (95 percent) of the respondents are covered by health insurance is both surprising good news. It certainly flies in the face of the beliefs of many and of Wallace (1984) who states that "Both the Ohio study and Tuckman's AAUP research reveal that a surprisingly high number of part-timers are not covered by fringe benefits from any source

. . . For example, 46 percent do not get health insurance" (p. 15).

Gappa and Leslie (1993) say that

> [b]y far the most important and controversial benefit for institutions and part-time faculty alike is health coverage. At every institution we visited where health benefits were not provided, this was a hot issue . . . Very few institutions provide benefits for part-time faculty, and when they do, it is usually the result of collective bargaining . . . only 16.6 percent . . . receive subsidized medical insurance compared with 97.4 percent of . . . full-timer(s) (p. 163).

Mosby (1999) reports that 6.5% of the 170 colleges in his study say that they make health care plans available to adjuncts, some partially or wholly paid for by the school (p.7).

Due to the demographics of the Washington, D.C. suburbs (where Colleges A and B are located), it may be that the 95 percent figure is skewed. But if (mostly rural) College C is seen as more representative of the typical American community college, even the 79 percent figure is not disheartening. Still, since many colleges and universities offer health insurance programs to students, why cannot adjuncts who meet criteria be included?

Retirement Plans

Questions 24 & 25

24. What retirement plan(s) do you have? *Social Security IRA other* ____

25. If an unsubsidized retirement plan were available at (your college), might you buy into it? *yes no*

Results and Discussion

Assembling of reliable data was complicated by the fact that a large percentage of respondents do not consider Social Security to be a "retirement plan." As an example, approximately one-third of the respondents did not circle "Social Security" whether or not they entered any other plans, when, in fact, virtually all of them do have FICA deductions from their pay.

Nonetheless, approximately 50% of respondents at colleges A and B answered yes to question #25, even though more than 50% of all respondents have at least 2 retirement plans.

Mosby (1999) reports that 10.6% of the 170 colleges in his study say that they make retirement plans available to adjuncts (p.7).

Commute Time

Question 26

How many hours per week do you spend in commuting to all classes that you teach on all campuses?

Table 20
(Question 26; *n = 473*)

Average Hours Spent Per Week
In Commuting to All Classes on All Campuses

A	B	C	A/B/C
3.0	2.7	2.2	**2.8**

Results and Discussions

The 2.8 average initially may seem on the high side, though it does gain relativity when the very urban Colleges A and B are contrasted with the mostly rural College C. For many of those adjuncts who have other employment commuting involves two different routes: from work to campus and from campus to home.

However, it should also be kept in mind that many adjuncts teach a course (or courses) that meet once a week. When Table 20 is viewed with Table 3's 5.13 average hours taught for the fall semester and Table 55A's 4.94 non-classroom hours devoted to each course, the typical respondent devotes almost eight hours to his or her five-hour class.

Notice of Reemployment & Adaptation to Your Schedule

Questions 27 & 28

27. How much do you feel (your campus) attempts to offer you classes and schedules that are adapted to your needs?

never / rarely *sometimes* *frequently* *always*

28. Are you usually given informal notice of probable reemployment for the next semester? *yes* *no*

Table 21

(Questions 27 & 28; *n = 466*)

Ratings of Colleges' Attempts to Offer Adapted Schedules and Percentages Who Are Given Informal Notice

	Nev/ Rar	Some	Freq	Alwys	Yes
College A	6.2	13.5	37.0	43.3	80.9
College B	5.3	16.2	35.8	41.5	85.3
College C	8.7	30.4	43.5	17.4	82.6
A/B/C	**5.8**	**15.9**	**36.7**	**41.0**	**83.5**

Results and Discussion

Approximately 80 percent of respondents say that colleges frequently or always attempt to adapt class times to meet their preferences, and in excess of 80 percent say they are given informal notice of probable reemployment for the next semester. Given the vagaries of juggling faculty to meet shifting registration numbers and that full-timers have first choice, the percentages seem within a reasonable range.

Types of Adjuncts and Desire for Full-Time Teaching Position

Questions 29 & 31

29. Circle the one that best describes you, *a, b, c, d, e,* or *f:*
   - *a)* Employed as an adjunct and hoping to get a full-time academic position nearby or elsewhere.
   - *b)* Semi-retired from either a full-time teaching or non-teaching career.
   - *c)* Employed permanently in a non-academic full-time job and teaching part-time at (your college).
   - *d)* Primarily responsible for running a household.
   - *e)* Primarily a graduate student earning a degree.
   - *f)* Free-lancer, by choice, not seeking full-time job.

31. If a full-time teaching job at (your college - any campus) became available, would you take it?

definitely *probably* *maybe* *no*

Table 22
(Questions 29 & 31; *n = 485*)

Types and Percentages of Adjuncts and Their Desire
For a Full-time Teaching Position on Campus

	a)		*b)*	*c)*	*d)*	*e)*	*f)*
	Hopers	Hoper-Takers*	Semi-Ret'd	F-T	House	Grad Stud	Free-Lance
College A	23.3	16.9	21.7	25.4	6.9	2.1	19.6
College B	24.6	16.2	10.7	43.8	4.0	3.3	13.6
College C	29.2	20.8	16.7	41.7	0.0	4.2	8.3
A/B/C	**24.3**	**16.7**	**15.3**	**36.5**	**5.6**	**2.9**	**15.7**

* "Hoper-Takers" are those "hopers" who went on to answer *definitely* to question #31; i.e., of the *n = 485* who answered both q.'s 29 and 31, 16.7% answered "hoping" and "definitely."

Results and Discussion

Several taxonomies of instructors in higher education have been developed. One of the first was Tuckman's in 1978, as cited by Gappa and Leslie (1993, p. 48), who go one to say that "no recent data permit a new test of this typology" (p. 47). Tuckman's "hopeful full-timers" category is defined as "those (in higher education) who could not find full-time positions but wanted them," which compares with this study's "hoping" adjuncts, who hope "to get a full-time academic position nearby or elsewhere" (question 29 *a*) and who would "take a full-time teaching job at your college . . . if it became available" (question 31). The percentages in that category for the two studies are 16.6 and 16.7, respectively.

Question 29's data for College A (Montgomery College) is 23.3 percent, which compares with Hemenways' (1988) figures that "Approximately one-fourth of the respondents (at Montgomery College) desire to enter college teaching as a full-time career" (p. 1).

Further similarity between Tuckman and this study is that Gappa (1984, p. 33) cites Tuckman as reporting that of the "hopeful full-timers"

62.5 percent "sought a full-time academic position" (the reason for the differential is not given), and this study's 76 percent differential between those who "hope to get a full-time position" and those who hope to get a full-time position *and* "would take a full-time job if it became available (q. 31)." Tuckman's "homeworker" 6.4 percentage compares with this study's "running a household" 5.6 percentage; his "full-mooners" percentage is 27.6 compared to this study's employed elsewhere "F-T" 36.5. The "graduate student" percentages are 21.2 and 2.9, which is not surprising given that Tuckman's study included universities. Given the parallels of these studies that are separated by 21 years, it is certainly entertainable that the salient constituents of the adjunct cohort are relatively stable, and it is only the size of the cohort and the external factors to it that have changed. Further comparisons are difficult because of category definitions.

Still, it must be said that in higher education as a whole, the AAUP reports that 52 percent of "those who hold part-time appointments say that they prefer to teach part-time" and that most hold other (full-time) jobs (Academe, Jan.-Feb. 1998, p. 56). And Roueche, Roueche and Milliron's (1995) taxonomy has four categories and no statistics (p. 46), but they do cite Silvers' 1990 figures, which have 56 percent of part-timers saying that "they would apply for a full-time position if it were available" at Arizona's Pima Community College (p. 87).

All in all, it appears that adjuncts in the academy at large and the community college in particular are not likely to coalesce into movements of redress.

An explanation of the difference between the adjunct's persona of malcontent that is seen by colleagues and the public, and his or her more private beliefs as shown by anonymous answers to questionnaires might be that held by Wilson (1998), who says that "You're (not) permitted to be happy if you're a part-timer. We're in a culture of misery, and if you're happy, you have to be quiet about it" (p. A9).

Further illumination comes from Wilson's quoting (p. A9) of Judith M.

Gappa, co-author of the aforementioned *The Invisible Faculty*: "The focus has been on aspiring academics, which are, according to our estimates, only 10 to 15 per cent of all part-timers."

Motivation for Teaching

Question 30

To describe your motivation for teaching, what percentage do you teach for financial reasons, and what percentage do you teach for intrinsic values?

financial ____% intrinsic _____ % (should total 100%)

Table 23

(Questions 1, 12, & 30; *478*)

Financial vs. Intrinsic Motivation for Teaching

(financial / intrinsic)

	Female	Male	Aggragate
Humanities	33 / 63	31 / 69	**31 / 69**
Non-Humanities	29 / 71	31 / 69	

Results and Discussion

The data suggests that approximately two-thirds of the motivation for teaching comes from intrinsic values; one-third is financial. The data shows almost no differences between sexes and disciplines taught - it is identical or nearly identical in all cells.

Available data suggests that these ratios may be relatively contant. For example, Hemenway (1988), in a survey of 431 Montgomery College adjuncts, says that "While the desire to earn money was among the influences selected by many of the respondents, it was not the most influential factor" (p. 1). In fact, in a mean ranking with 11 other factors for teaching, "Desire to earn money" ranked seventh; "Enjoy teaching" was first (p. 6.).

Gappa and Leslie (1993) report that most part-timers derive satisfaction from the intrinsic rewards of teaching (p. 40). They also say that "Those with intrinsic motivations are almost always also employed elsewhere and are motivated to teach part-time because of the satisfaction the work itself brings them" and to repay the obligations they owe to society (p. 37). Extrinisic motivations include money, status, and entree to full-time employment in the college.

Citing Tuckman's 1978 study, Gappa reports

> [t]he leading motive for teaching part time was intrinsic, a matter of personal satisfaction . . . The next most frequent major motivation was professional . . . They brought current field practice to the classroom . . . The third major motivation was career aspiration . . . hopeful full-timers . . . who wanted full-time work as college teachers . . . The least frequent motivation was economic . . . (pp. 35-36).

Elizabeth Foote (1996) cites a study 1991 study by Kelly of 149 adjuncts conducted at Prince George's Community college in Maryland (the third of the three community colleges in Washington, D.C.'s suburbs) which reveal that "personal satisfaction and acquiring teaching experience for career purposes were (the) primary reasons" for their teaching (p. 204).

The primacy of intrinsic motivation of the respondents in this study is echoed by Bok as quoted in Cohen and Brawer (1996): "Professors who do not want to teach anymore probably suffer from deeper problems of motivation beyond the reach of crude incentives such as money . . ." (p. 92).

Satisfaction With the College As an Employer

Question 33

Overall, as an employee, how would you describe your association with (your college) as an employer?

very satisfying	somewhat satisfying	rarely satisfying	never satisfying	no opinion

Table 24

(Question 33; *n = 486*)

Satisfaction With the College As an Employer

	very	somewhat	rarely	never	no ans
College A	37%	52%	4%	4%	3%
College B	40	48	6	4	2
College C	54	42	0	4	0
A/B/C	**40**	**49**	**5**	**4**	**2**

Results and Discussion

Gappa and Leslie cite the NSOPF 1988 survey of part-time faculty as reporting 41 percent who were "very satisfied" with their jobs, and 46 percent who were "somewhat" satisfied with their jobs (p. 40).

Wilson (1998) cites 1993 NCES statistics which have 86 per cent of higher-ed adjuncts "satisfied with their jobs" (p. A9).

Kroll (1994) reports that 50 percent of adjunct English teachers give an "excellent" or "good" rating to "administration at institution," which is in contrast to this study's 89 percent who give ratings of very and somewhat satisfying, though it must be said that adjuncts who teach humanities courses are often seen to be not as positive as other adjuncts.

"Satisfaction with the college as an employer" may well be different from "enjoy(s) classroom teaching" (see question 57, Table 42).

B. Peers, The Chair, and The Community

This section of the survey dealt with the feeling of community and frequency of contacts. There is little comparative data for analysis. Surprising results include the variation among campuses.

Significant Interactions With Fellow Adjuncts

Question 37

How many times per semester do you have significant interactions with fellow adjuncts about academic matters? _______

Table 25

(Question 37; *n = 443*)

Percentage of Adjuncts
Who Have No Contact with Their Adjunct Peers
(Campus and College)

	A1	A2	A3	**A**	B1	B2	B3	B4	B5	**B**	**C**
% who have zero signif. interactions w/ adjuncts*	54	38	27	**39**	41	41	41	55	59	**45**	**33**

* computations do not include those who did not give any answer

Results and Discussion

There appears to be no relationship to the size of the campus and the percentages of adjuncts who have no contact with their adjunct peers . For example, Campuses A2, B1 and B2 are by far the largest of those two college's eight campuses, and yet they are relative opposites. Further, campuses A1 and A3 are about the same size, as are B3, B4, and B5, and they, too, are at considerable variance. (College C has three campuses, and all are included in the 33 percent.)

Of the respondents who answered "zero" to this question, 86, 70, and 88 percent at Colleges A, B, and C respectively said they "would prefer to feel like a member of (their) professional community" (see questions 34 and 35, Table 28).

When the data of this question is combined with that in questions 38 (Table 30) and 50 (Table 32), we discover that about one half of the adjunct members of their "community" college have zero interactions with their peers, receive no appreciation for their work, and receive zero invitations to attend their department's meetings, which perhaps explains why 69 percent feel "somewhat" or "not at all" a member of their community (question 34).

Communication and Contact with Supervisors

Questions 36 & 39

36. How many times per semester do you typically meet with your supervisor and/or team leader? _______
39. How effective is the communication of your department /unit's full-time faculty and support staff with you?

extremely effective   *quite effective*   *marginally effective*   *not at all effective*

Table 26
(Question 36; *n = 461*)

Number of Meetings With Supervisor Per Semester
(Campus and College)

A1	A2	A3	**A**	B1	B2	B3	B4	B5	**B**	**C**
2.7	2.1	3.1	**2.4**	2.2	1.7	1.8	1.7	1.9	**1.8**	**2.4**

Table 27
(Question 39; *n = 461*)

Department's and Full-Time Faculty's
Communication Effectiveness
(Campus and College)

	A1	A2	A3	**A**	B1	B2	B3	B4	B5	**B**	**C**
Percent Who Say Comm is "Quite" or "Extrem." Effect.	78	67	76	**71**	50	55	70	68	57	**57**	**54**
Percent Who Say Commo is "Margin." or "Not at All Effect."	22	33	24	**29**	50	45	30	32	43	**43**	**46**

Results and Discussion

At first blush, when inter-college comparisons are made of A and B, it would appear a higher frequency of meetings results in more effective communication (A's 2.4 / 71 compared to B's 1.8 / 57. However, that observation does not hold up when intra-college comparisons are made. For example, campus B1 has the highest frequency of meetings but the lowest communication effectiveness, while B4 has the lowest meetings and the highest effectiveness.

Central to these issues are the department chairs, who Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron say "often have sole responsibility for recruiting, selecting, and orienting part-time faculty," yet, most (quoting Gapa and Leslie) "are underprepared and administratively overwhelmed in trying to deal responsibly with part-time faculty issues" . . . they receive little training . . . yet they are the key administrators in supervising the largest faculty cohort in today's community colleges" (p. 15).

Speaking further about chairs, Gappa and Leslie (1993) say that "It is the *department chair* who . . . makes decisions that affect the lives . . . and careers of part-time faculty" (p.143). They found that "At one end of the continuum (were) institutions that were making no changes . . . at the other end . . . some had developed comprehensive employment policies for part-timers . . . (but) Whatever the institutional position, the key to effective implementation was the department chair . . . institutions must recognize the pivotal role of department chairs" (p. 177).

With increasing reliance upon part-timers, more and more supervision falls on the shoulders of the shrinking full-time faculty. Styne (1997) says that the frequent turnover of course coordinators "reflects the difficult and time-consuming nature" of the responisibilties, and that in smaller departments, department chairs "bear the full responsibility of hiring, managing, and evaluating" (p. 51).

These results verify that communication by the department chair is crucial. Gappa and Leslie go on to note that "The focus of greatest concern is the department chair, who may be guilty of sins of commission (p. 191) . . . the attitude of the department chair makes an enormous difference in the degree to which part-timers are integrated" (p. 186).

Membership in Community

Questions 34 & 35

34. How much do you feel like a member of (your campus) professional community?
35. What is the level at which you would prefer to feel like a member of (your campus) professional community?

Table 28

(Questions 34 & 35; *n = 462*)

Feelings of Membership in the Professional Community

	totally	*quite a bit*	*somewhat*	*not at all*	*no answer*
Now Feel Like a Member	5%	24%	53%	16%	2%
Prefer to Feel Like a Member	26%	45%	27%	1%	1%

Results and Discussion

The data indicate that the respondents have a significant desire to feel more a member of their professional community. For example, the 16 percent in the "now feel not at all" category drops to 1 percent, and the "somewhat"s drop by half. Further, "now feel quite a bit" (24%) and "now feel totally" (5%) are combined, their 29% more than doubles to 71 percent who would "prefer quite a bit" or "totally" to feel like members of the community.

Kroll (1994) reported that 50 percent of English-teaching adjuncts in New York state felt "excellent" or "good" about the "Sense of Community at Institution," which contrasts with the combined 29% for the "totally" and "quite a bit" categories above.

Roueche, Roueche and Milliron (1995) state that "In a social vacuum, without social status in the academic community, the part-time teacher sees himself denied the opportunity to become a part of the intellectual mainstream of the college . . . This state of affairs seems alive and well in most community colleges" (p. 17). They continue that " . . . evidence . . . suggest(s) that most part-timers are not integrated into a college with a formal orientation experience at the majority of American community colleges" (p. 79).

Gappa and Leslie (1993) agree, saying that "Part-timers have very strong feelings about whether they are or are not 'connected' to or 'integrated' into campus life. For the most part, they feel powerless, aliented, invisible, and second class" (p. 180).

However, paradoxically Cohen and Brawer (1996) say that non-allegiance to the profession at large may serve to enchance teaching. "Some commentators have reasoned that the community college is best served by a group of instructors with minimal allegiance to a profession. They contend professionalism invariably leads to a form of cosmopolitanism that ill suits a community-centered institution . . . ." (p. 96).

The paradox continues when the data from this community membership issue is contrasted with that in question 40 (Table 31, below) - adjuncts' desire for participation in governance - which is minimal. How can a clear desire to belong be reconciled to a clear desire to not participate?

One answer might be that the data attends to a society-at-large malaise of alienation. Another (simpler and more positive) answer is that while adjuncts don't want to govern, they do want to be more professional - they desire to be better, more connected instructors of students.

Faculty integration is a perplexing problem. Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron (1995) say that

> [t]he general literature has not produced *any* (italics this author's) evidence of national trends; *no* (italics this author's) have emerged from these studies that indicate how best to effect part-timers' successful integration into college communities" (p. 38).

Community and the Internet

Questions 16 & 41

16. Do you have the use of an internet e-mail address?
41. If an on-line community of department peers were available, would you participate?

Table 29
(Questions 16 & 41; *n = 388 / 328*)

Percentages That Have an E-mail Address;
Percentages That Would Participate
in an On-Line Community
(have / would)

A	B	C	A/B/C
76 / 59	85 / 73	54 / 71	**80 / 67**

Results and Discussion

For none of the 10 campuses did the percentage of yeses for questions 16 and 41 fall below 50. When the individual responses to these two questions are paired, the frequency of no / yes was about the same as yes / no.

A very large majority (80 percent) have an e-mail address and half of those say they would participate, as would half of those who do not have an e-mail address.

Given the responses to question 35, which show a very substantial desire of adjuncts to increase their feeling of membership in their professional community, and the responses to the immediately foregoing questions 36, 37, and 39, it seems that some use of the internet would be advantageous to all.

Demonstrated Appreciation

Question 38

How many times each semester does your department/unit show its appreciation for your work? ______

Table 30
(Question 38; *n = 402*)

Departmental Demonstration of Appreciation
<Campus and College>

	A1	A2	A3	**A**	B1	B2	B3	B4	B5	**B**	**C**
Percent of Adjuncts to Whom Dept. Shows Apprec. 1 or More Times Per Semester*	56	49	64	**54**	49	44	75	64	52	**51**	**68**

* includes those whose answers were 1 or more, or who wrote in "sufficiently," "often," etc.;

Results and Discussion

About half of the respondents say that they are not shown appreciation for their work. It may be that appreciation is communicated to adjuncts via memos, notices, etc., but even so, perception eclipses reality.

Of the 402 respondents to question 38, only one said she had received formal recognition from her college.

Desire for Role in Governance

Question 40

How much desire do you have to participate in departmental governance? *none at all* *very little* *some* *quite a bit*

Table 31
(Question 40; *n = 475*)
Adjunct Faculty Desire to Participate in Governance

	None at All	Very Little	Some	Quite a Bit
Colleges **A/B/C**	20%	35%	36%	9%

Results and Discussion

Question 40 was one of those most answered; 97.7 percent of the respondents did so. Ninety-four percent of the respondents have some, very little, or no desire to participate in governance. The percentages among the three colleges in all four categories varied less than three percent.

Gappa and Leslie (1993) cite a 1985 survey by Williams "which showed that only about one-third of part-time faculty at innovative community colleges reported any level of involvement in departmental affairs" (p. 189).

A few pages later Gappa and Leslie say that "There is obvious frustration among part-timers who feel deprived of a voice" (p. 196).

"Some part-timers have strong motives to be more engaged in the life of the institution, and they have ideas about how to strengthen their role as constructive participants" (p. 197). They continue: "When senior faculty are involved in governance, a schism sometimes develops in their reactions to part-time faculty . . . senior faculty may view part-timers as second-class citizens who represent a covert attack . . . " (197).

A few years earlier, Gappa (1984) said that "A good many part-time faculty express a great deal of satisfaction with their disenfranchisement and lack of involvement in the governance of the instituion . . . some perceive committee work . . . and collegiate decision making as a distracting and ungratifying drudgery" (p. 70). It is likely that few adjuncts find departmental and institutional governance intrinsically rewarding.

The Handbook for the Faculty of Montgomery College (Handbook, 1998) states that "faculty participation . . . has been an integral part of Montgomery College since its inception . . . governance is a shared responsibility in which faculty play an important role . . . . "(p. 18). However, the Handbook does not include part-timers in campus governance: "Campus-Level Governance: On the campus level, there are two types of formal governance processes in which full-time faculty members may become involved: the work of the campus Faculty Councils; and the faculty hiring and evaluation processes (p. 19).

At NVCC, the 1996-97 Faculty Handbook (Appendix H, Constitution and Bylaws) does not allow P-13 (part-time) status employees membership on either of the governing bodies (the Campus Council and the College Senate).

With governance, which comes first, the chicken or the egg - nonenfranchisement or no desire for enfranchisement? Is the issue one of nurture or nature? Left open is the question "If adjuncts were granted elligibilty, how many would participate?"

Invitations to departmental meetings

Question 50

In the past two years at (your campus), how many times have you been invited to attend departmental meetings? *0 1 2 3 4 5+*

Table 32

(Question 50; *n = 429*)

Invitations to Departmental Meetings
<Campus and College>

	A1	A2	A3	**A**	B1	B2	B3	B4	B5	**B**	**C**
% Who Received No Invites During Past Two Years*	69	35	35	**42**	41	48	52	59	52	**48**	**74**
Aver. # of Invites Per Year				**1.1**						**0.7**	**0.8**

* computations do not include those who did not give any answer

Results and Discussion

Approximately one-half of the respondents received zero invitations for the preceding two years, which is similar to the data in question 38 (Table 30 - demonstrated appreciation). The other half received less than one invitation per year. Restated, from questions 38 and 50 it can be concluded concluded that about half of adjuncts are told neither that they are welcome nor appreciated.

C. Evaluation and Professional Development:

Evaluations by Students and Supervisors;
Seminars, Conventions, and Publishing

Frequency and Value of Student Evaluations of Instructors

Questions 42, 43 & 44

42. How frequently are your students given instructor evaluation forms at the end of the semester? *always frequently infrequently never*

43. Does your department inform you of the results? *yes no*

44. How valuable are those student evaluations for developing your classroom effectiveness? *very moderately marginally not at all*

Table 33

(Questions 42 & 43; *n = 367 / 354*)

Frequency of Student Evaluations and Department Feedback

	Percent Whose Students Are Always or Freq. Given the Forms	Percent of Adjuncts Who Are Not Given The Results
College **A**	71	8.2
College **B**	78	3.8
College **C**	79	21.0
A/B/C	**76**	**6.3**

Table 34

(Question 44; *n = 181*)

Value to Adjunct of Returned Student Evaluations

	very	moderately/ marginally	not at all
College **A**	26%	55%	9%
College **B**	34	61	5
College **C**	33	67	0
A/B/C	**31**	**62**	**7**

Results and Discussion

Nearly one-quarter of the responding adjuncts are not in a position to learn about their teaching from their students because the students are not given the opportunity. Over two-thirds of those whose students are given forms find them moderately, marginally, or not at all valuable.

Roueche, Roueche and Milliron (1995) advise that student evaluation results should be given to the instructor within two weeks (p. 130), and that "Research findings have established that student evaluations are a valid measure of teaching effectiveness, particularly when student achievement is considered the outcome of good teaching" (128). Citing Miller, they continue: "Those who oppose use of student appraisals deny the single most important data basis for judging teaching effectiveness (p. 128).

Classroom Observation and Feedback

Questions 52 and 53

52. In the past two years, how many times have you been observed in your classroom by a peer or supervisor? *0 1 2 3 4+*
53. How much of the feedback that you received from the observer(s) after classroom observation were you able to use?

most of it *some of it* *very little* *none*

Table 35
(Question 52; *n = 433*)

Percentages and Averages of
Classroom Observation by Peer or Supervisor Per Year*

	A	B	C	A/B/C
% That Answered Zero	54	55	65	**55**
Annual* Aver. of All Others	.84	.78	1.1	**.83**

* data converted to per annum

Table 36*
(Question 53; *n = 189*)

Opinions on Usefulness of
Classroom Observation Feedback

	A	B	C	A/B/C
Percentage That Answered Most or Some	75	66	75	**70**
Percentage That Answered Little or None	25	34	25	**30**

Results and Discussion

Over half of the respondents had not been observed in the classroom during the previous two years. The remainder had been observed about once (.83 times). Approximately two-thirds of those who were observed felt that "most" or "some" of the feedback on the observation was useful; the remaining third found the feedback of little or no value.

These attitudes are borne out by Cohen and Brawer's (1996) observations that "Superficially, the procedures (of faculty evaluation) gave the appearance of attempting to improve instruction. Practically, they had little effect . . . only a miniscule percentage of the staff was affected. Instructors who wanted to improve could act on the commentary of peers, administrators, and students. Those who chose instead to ignore the feedback could do so" (p. 89), and that " . . . evaluations conducted for the primary purpose of satisfying external agenicies have little effect, and the staff tend tend to be dissatisfied with them . . . (however), evaluations related to instructional practices can be useful in enhancing perceived effectiveness (p. 90).

The data is also confirmed by the AAUP's *Academe* (Jan.-Feb. 1998): "Part-time (and adjunct . . .) faculty members are far less likely to receive regular evaluation and feedback from professional colleagues or to have opportunities to interact with colleagues . . ." (p. 55).

Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron (1995) say that generally "evaluation has never been particularly welcome as a guest at the education table" and that in a larger sense "evaluation of educational programs has triggered criticisms of narrowness, irrelevance, and unfairness . . . While the foregoing thoughts apply more to educational programs, the attitude does include the classroom instructor" (p. 122).

Citing Boyer, they continue that "If teaching is to assume the status it deserves, the performance of each teacher in each classroom should, we believe, be formally assessed" . . . (even though) the problems implicit in measuring teacher performance are many" (p.123).

They allow that human complexities, and the reliabiltiy and validity of the observations offer problems. Further, scarce time and money resources render unlikely their advice (citing from Miller) that "The visiting teams should be composed of two individuals . . . Planning . . . should include the teacher who will be visited . . . A postsession with the teacher . . . and the observing team . . . the tentative conclusions (should be discussed) . . . Prepare a final report . . . respond in writing p. 127)

Montgomery College requires that "part-time faculty will be evaluated during their first semester appointment and at least once prior to advancement in salary grade (Handbook, p. 40) but does not specifically require any classroom observations beyond that.

On an admonitional plane, Roueche, Rouche, and Milliron (1995) continue that

> [t]he admonition is old and the source unknown, but the advice is sage and clear: "To achieve a goal, you must inspect what you expect" . . . Most studies report that evaluation does not occur or needs radical revision before it can be used to provide any assurance that quality teaching is occurring . . . Others report that most evaluation plans are poorly implemented, are inconsistent, are too cumbersome, have inadequate follow-up . . . are conducted too sporadically, do not distinguish between good and bad teachers, and generally are too weak and incomplete. Moreover, there are too many part-timers and too few evaluators for fair and competent assessment (p. 151).

It all becomes somewhat moot if we are to believe what chairs confidently told Gappa and Leslie (1993): "The department chairs we interviewed were clear and unequivocal in agreeing that they know, regardless of evaluation methodologies, when part-time faculty members do not teach well" (p. 168).

Professional Development Sessions Offered and Attended

Questions 46 & 47

46. In the past two years, how many professional development meetings have you attended (on campus)? *0 1 2 3 4 5+*

47. How many have been made available to you? *0 1 2 3 4 5+*

Table 37

(Questions 46 & 47; *n = ~ 420*)

Availability and Utilization of Professional Development Sessions

Campus and **College**	Development Sessions Made Available in Past 2 years (q. 47)*	Development Sessions Attended in Past 2 Years (q. 46)	Percent of Sessions Utilized in Past 2 Years
A1	2.0	0.8	40
A2	2.4	1.0	25
A3	2.4	1.5	48
B1	1.7	1.1	65
B2	3.1	1.8	58
B3	2.9	2.0	69
B4	1.3	0.7	54
B5	2.5	1.2	58
A	**2.3**	**1.1**	**48**
B	**2.4**	**1.4**	**58**
C	**2.0**	**1.4**	**70**
A/B/C	**2.4**	**1.3**	**54**

* Average per person. Note that the figures are bi-annual.

Results and Discussion

Translated into annual terms, as a cohort the respondents at the three colleges were offered 1.2 professional development meetings, and attended .6 of them.

It would appear that the espoused ethics of Cohen and Brawer's (1996) statement that "The (community) colleges have emphasized the importance of good teaching since their earliest days, and their observers have reported unanimously that teaching was their raison d'etre" (p. 161) are not borne out by practice at the colleges in this study.

In her chapter on "Part-timers in Two-Year Colleges: Assessing and Improving Performance," Gappa (1984) cites a 1982 study by Leslie, Kellum and Gunne which found that "under 10 percent provided any meaningful research support to part-time faculty," that 68% of 114 responding deans said they provided "some" professional development, and that the "most common activities were designed to help part-timers learn about college requirements . . . only in a few cases were part-time faculty given opportunities to improve teaching" (p. 87). Gappa continues: "Seventeen percent of the deans replied that some form of compensation was given to part-time faculty for participation in professional development activities" (p. 88).

Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron (1995) say that

> Colleges report that their efforts to provide staff development are limited by the time constraints that part-timers have, by the college's own inability or unwillingness to provide compensation for participating in such programs, and by a reluctance to commit additional funds for employees who have loose ties to the college and may well be gone within a matter of months (p. 15).

The dearth of professional development activities pervades much of higher education. For example, "Working For Renewal" (1998), a 188-page kit produced by the AAUP, makes scant mention of the domain of improving the pedagogical product: "Improve your instruction by attending professional meetings, societies, workshops, and by reading current literature in your field. Ask your colleagues, department chair, or program coordinators for assistance when necessary" (Sec. 2.3, p. 5). A second example is the California Faculty Association's 28-page Handbook, (contained in the AAUP kit) makes no mention of professional develop-ment. And third, Section 3.3 contains models of three collective bargaining agreements. The first two make no mention of professional development, and the third, Kent State University's 1996 collective bargaining agree- ment, contains one mention of professional development: " . . . (faculty) will be eligible to participate in professional development programs . . . " (Section 3.3), a clause which does not mandate professional development but only declares eligibility.

It could be argued that since the above falls within the domain of collective bargaining in higher education, it presents a skewed view of professional development. It might also be interpreted as a blind spot in unionism.

NVCC's Fact Book's (1998) Table 3.1 reports that 0.23 percent of maintenance and operations expenditures goes to "professional development." In other words, of every budget dollar spent, less than one quarter of one penny is devoted to improving all employees' performance. Not known is how much of that quarter-penny is invested directly into the improvement of instructors' classroom skills. Ten percent of that quarter-penny sounds liberal; one percent would not be surprising. If the answer is in between, at about five percent of the quarter-penny, that would mean that about 1 / 100th of a penny of each of the 80,950,173 dollars of the NVCC annual budget is dedicated to improving the *in situ* delivery of knowledge to students. And this in an institution whose *raison d'etre* is the encouragment of growth, of development.

The institutional research office at Montgomery College informed this researcher that it does not publish the equivalent of NVCC's Fact Book. The college's 203-page "Part-Time Faculty Handbook" (1995-96) contains virtually no mention of professional development.

Attitudes Towards Mandatory Professional Development Sessions and Peer Mentoring

Questions 48 & 49

48. To what extent would you agree with a policy that requires all adjuncts and full-timers (on your campus) to attend at least one professional development session per semester?

totally *quite a bit* *somewhat* *opposed*

49. To what extent would you agree with an on-going program of peer mentoring (including exchange of classroom visits)?

not at all *somewhat* *quite a bit* *totally*

Table 38

(Questions 48 & 49; *n = ~ 468*)

Opinions on Mandatory Professional Development Sessions; Support and Opposition to Peer Mentoring*

	Mandatory Pro. Dev.		Peer Mentoring	
Campus and **College**	Agree Totally or Quite a Bit	Agree Somewhat or Opposed	Agree Totally or Quite a Bit	Agree Somewhat/ Not at All
A1	38%	62%	20%	80%
A2	46	54	29	71
A3	41	59	25	75
B1	39	61	26	74
B2	40	63	23	75
B3	34	66	26	74
B4	36	64	24	76
B5	24	76	10	90
A	42	58	27	73
B	37	63	23	77
C	27	73	9	91
A/B/C	**38**	**62**	**24**	**76**

* those who did not answer both questions were excluded

Results and Discussion

One of the most surprising and optimistic findings of this study is that 38 per cent of the the respondents affirm their desire to improve their teaching by weighing in for mandatory professional development sessions. Further, nearly one-quarter support peer mentoring that includes exchange of classroom visits, which seems to fly in the face of the "Teaching is generally acknowledged to be solo performance; the door to the classroom is jealously guarded" mentality (Cohen and Brawer, 1996, p. 96).

Questions 48 and 49 did not mention monetary compensation for professional development. Given the history of the extreme scarcity of funds for adjuncts generally and professional development specifically, it seems fair to conclude that the respondents to the questions assumed that the time that they would devote to peer mentoring would not be compensated.

Some colleges do pay adjuncts for attending staff development activities. For example, Cowley County Community College (CCCC) in Kansas uses a four-level pay scale, based on number of semesters taught (Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron, p. 101). Specific dollar amounts are not given - only "CCCC uses a part-time faculty pay scale" (p. 101) is mentioned. De Anza college in California and Hagerstown Junior College in Maryland also compensate adjuncts for completing professional development sessions and programs (p. 103).

There is virtually no research on the details or successes of college professional development programs that adjunct instructors are "required," "expected," or "must" attend or that result in increased compensation via either per hour of attendance or increased salary if they are voluntarily attended. Roueche, Roueche and Milliron (1995) mention several, e.g. Cuesta College and De Anza Colleges in California and Hagerstown Junior College in Maryland (p. 102-3). Many of the programs that are mentioned appear to be geared for the newcomers.

What is largely absent from the literature is research (or even casual mention) of mentoring for veteran adjuncts. A few colleges have programs designed primarily for the development of classroom skills for the newcomer; Community College of Aurora (CCA) in Colorado (Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron, p. 99) and Pima Community College in Arizona are two.

The CCA program contains elements that might well be addressed by a veteran peer mentoring program (e.g., teaching effectiveness seminars on a wide variety of subjects), but one suspects that those instructors who answered positively to question #39 of this study are looking for a vehicle that will enhance their existing skills.

What do adjuncts see as subjects to learn more about? Foote (1996) cites a 1991 study of 163 adjuncts by Rhodes which showed that student assessment, teaching methodology, and curriculum updating were paramount (p. 205).

Cohen and Brawer (1996) feel that "It is likely that most students can succeed in (college) if they are required to (attend) learning labs and peer-group assistance" (p. 270). Would replacing "required" with "able," and "students" with "instructors" reduce the validity of the statement?

Regarding professional development as a whole, Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron (1995) say

> [w]ith three exceptions, these colleges (in our study) did not require any on-site demonstration of teaching ability, and only one college required a writing sample . . . (p. 57). If good teaching is the hallmark of American community colleges, then colleges should bring serious attention to the critical steps of identifying those who can best deliver it. Moreover, having made their decisions, colleges must put time and thoughtful efforts into orienting part-timers to their environment and into providing them with training for their professional growth and development" (p. 57).

Adjunct Availability for Professional Development Sessions

Question 45

For professional development sessions are you generally available in/on the:

daytime? *yes no* evening? *yes no* weekend? *yes no*

Table 39

(Question 45; *n = 473*)

Availability for Professional Development Sessions

	Percentages of Yes and No			
	3 no's	3 yeses	2 yeses	1 yes
College A	8	18	36	38
College B	6	15	41	38
College C	4	17	33	46
A/B/C	**7**	**16**	**39**	**38**

Results and Discussion

The percentages of the number of yeses at the three colleges are remarably consistent; e.g., three of the four categories of Colleges A and B are within three percent. As a whole, 93 percent say they are available for at least one of the time slots, and 55 percent say they are available for two or three of the slots. This expression of availability makes it clear that many not only desire professional development, but also are available for it as well.

It should be noted that the question deals specifically with professional development. A not infrequent comment written next to the answers of question 45 was akin to "If they are worth while!" Table 39 seems to show desire by many adjuncts to improve their craft.

Conventions/Seminars & Research Publications

Question 51 & 54

51. How many off-campus educational conventions/seminars
have you attended in the past two years? *0 1 2 3 4 5+*

Table 40

(Question 51; *n = 469*)

Average Yearly* Convention Attendance

College	A	B	C	A/B/C
	0.56	0.59	0.77	**0.59**

* data converted to per annum

54. In the past two years, how many research papers have you published or presented to a convention/seminar? *0 1 2 3 4*

Table 41

(Question 54; *n = 463*)

Average Number of Publications Per Year*

A	B	C	**A/B/C**
0.23	0.20	0.17	**0.21**

* data converted to per annum

Results and Discussion

Another way of stating Table 41 is that at colleges A, B, and C the typical respondent presents or publishes one paper every 4.3, 5.0, and 5.9 years respectively.

Kroll (1994) has 18 percent presenting one paper in the preceding three years, and 29 percent who published an article in the preceding three years.

Kroll (1994) says that 43 percent of part-time two-year college English instructors in New York State attended a conference in the preceding three years.

Historically, the primary focus of community colleges has been on teaching; research has not enjoyed much priorty. Further, the literature says little about research by adjuncts, so discussion of the above data must be within the context of studies done on research performed by full-timers. Most, if not all, elements that are valid for research by full-timers apply equally to adjuncts.

Mahaffey and Welsh (1993), performed a study of 127 faculty members at Midlands Technical College in Texas. The study focused on the effect of scholarship on faculty vitality. Forty of the 127 were "scholar-teachers" (full-timers who had published or presented at least once in the preceding three years) and "80" were full-time teachers (p. 33).

The authors define scholarship as an "umbrella" of "systematic pursuit of a topic (and the) rational inquiry that involves critical analysis." Under that umbrella of scholarship is research, which is defined as the "objective search for new knowledge or new application of existing knowledge (which is) verifiable (and) replica(ble)" (p. 35).

The findings of the Mahaffey/Welsh study were mixed. They did find that "faculty scholarship positively affected teaching, afforded scholar-teachers more control over their own environments, (and) fostered indentification with the larger higher education community" (p. 38). However, they also concluded that there was "no statistically significant difference between teachers and scholar-teachers" in the "value-added or skills-development measures" of "communication and interpersonal skills, knowledge of discipline, teaching methods, creative problem solving, keeping current in the field, respect for students, leadership, networking and administrative skills" (p. 38). As well, "the responses of both groups indicated that the most pleasurable or rewarding blend of their professional time was teaching and scholarship in the discipline" (p. 35).

As mentioned in the discussion on questions 34 and 35, paradoxically, " . . . professionalism among university faculties . . . has prove(n) detrimental to teach . . . as faculty allegiance turned more to research, scholarship, and academic disciplinary concerns, interest in teaching waned" (Cohen and Brawer, 1996, p. 97).

D. Students and the Classroom

Enjoyment of Classroom Teaching

Question 57

On a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 representing never and 5 representing all of the time, how much of the time do you enjoy classroom teaching? *1 2 3 4 5*

Table 42
(Question 57; *n = 476*)
Time Spent in Enjoyment
of Classroom Teaching (all colleges)

< never	- - - - - -	- - - - - -	- - - - - -	*always>*
1	2	3	4	5
0.2%	0.4%	3.7%	44.3%	51.4%

Results and Discussion

Over one-half of the respondents always enjoy teaching, with another 44.3 percent close behind, for a total of 96 percent that clearly enjoy teaching. No significant differences between males and females or among the 11 campuses were seen. These figures are consistent with the data generated by question 30 (Table 23), which showed that for 61 percent of adjuncts' motivation was intrinsic.

Cohen and Brawer (1996) cite numerous studies that show

> elements leading to personal satisfaction are related to the content of the work, whereas the environment surrounding the worker leads to dissatisfaction . . . feedback from students was most likely to lead to feelings of satisfaction, whereas characteristics of the workplace, such as lack of suport from administrators . .. led to dissatisfaction" (p. 91).

If that is the case, then clearly the respondents in this study receive positive feedback from students, but the inclusion of "classroom" in the question prevents speculation on the "lack of support from administrators" element of the equation. However, when this question is paired with the results of question 33 (Table 24), which showed that 40 percent of respondents were "very satisfied" and another 49 percent were "somewhat" satisfied with their employer, and only 9 percent "rarely" or "never" satisfied. it seems reasonable to conclude that the great majority of adjuncts are happy in their classroom and reasonably satisfied with their employer.

Self-Evaluation and Self-Comparison With Full-Time Faculty

Questions 59 and 65

59. How do you rank your own teaching effectiveness?

excellent *above average* *average* *below average*

65. When you compare the overall classroom effectiveness of adjuncts with the overall classroom effectiveness of full-timers, which do you think adjuncts are?

less effective *as effective* *more effective* *no opinion*

Table 43

(Question 59; *n = 477*)

Self-evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness

	Excellent	Above Average	Average	Below Average
A/B/C	25%	58%	17%	0%

Table 44

(Question 65; *n = 454*)

Adjuncts' Self-Comparison With Full-Timers

	A	B	C	A/B/C
% Who Think Adjuncts Are More Effect.	9	20	17	**16**
% Who Think Adjuncts Are As Effect.	68	64	62	**65**
% Who Think Adjuncts Are Less Effect.	4	4	4	**4**
% Who Have No Opinion	19	12	17	**15**

Results and Discussion

The data generated by question 59 indicates that the respondents are confident of their teaching; not one is less than average.

The 83 percent who see themselves as above average corresponds to the 81 percent who see themselves as "as effective" or "more effective" than their full-time counterparts. This researcher's hat is off to the judicious15 percent who answered "no opinion" to question 65 (Table 44).

Many studies do not find "statistically significant" differences in the competence of adjuncts compared to full-timers. Cohen and Brawer (1996), for example, say that "studies usually find that students view part-timers about the way they do the full-timers and that differences in grades awarded, student retention, and student learning cannot be ascribed to their instructors' employment status" (p. 90). While there is literature which says that adjuncts are more competent, it tends to be anecdotal and limited to small and specialized programs.

Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron (1995) observe that "In reality, there are limited hard data to support whether part-time faculty are any better or any worse than full-time faculty" (p. 18), and that "Despite the heated debate over the instructional quality (of) part-time faculty, more than twenty years of research points to little or no difference in the instructional ability of part-time faculty" (p. 11).

Gappa and Leslie's (1993) views are similar:

> We also found a virtually universal belief that part-timers who do not measure up to expectations are not reappointed. Although an institution might make a strategic mistake by granting tenure to a full-time faculty member who is a poor teacher, it almost never retains a part-time faculty member who has difficulty in the classroom. In a sense, then, part-timers may be held to a higher standard of teaching performance on average (p. 125).

Taking issue with the "higher standard of teaching" issue is the AAUP, which states in *Academe* (1998) that

> (Use of) large numbers of . . . part-time and adjunct faculty results in the nonrenewal of many tenure-track faculty whose qualifications and performance often exceeds that of the temporary faculty, who most often are not subject to . . . stringent review" (p. 57).

Adding budget issues into the mix, Gappa (1984) cites three studies that found: "part-timers are as effective as full-timers and at a lower cost (Cruise, 1980), and "no significant differences were found between full-time and part-time faculty (Willet, 1980 and Parsons, 1983). Gappa concluded that "part-time faculty by themselves do not detract from the quality of instruction and . . . they can enrich it greatly" (p. 84).

Student Preparation

Question 58

How academically prepared for your classes is your average student?

very prepared	*adequately prepared*	*marginally prepared*	*poorly prepared*	*not prepared*

Table 45

(Qustion 58; *n = 468*)

Percentages of Adjuncts Who Feel That Students Are:

Very Prepared	Adequately Prepared	Marginally Prepared	Poorly Prepared	Not Prepared
2.7	42.8	44.1	9.8	0.4

Results and Discussion

Slightly less than half of the respondents feel that students are "very" or "adequately" prepared, and slightly more than half feel that students are marginally, poorly, or not prepared.

Kroll (1994) cites figures that have 72 percent of two-year college students as "seriously underprepared," compared to the above 54.3 percent total of students who are less than adequately prepared.

The 1998-99 Almanac of the Chronicle of Higher Education reports that 12.1 percent of the faculty at two-year public institutions agree "strongly or somewhat" that most students at their college are well prepared, compared to 20.7 for public four-year institutions and 45.4 percent for private universities (p. 32), percentages which roughly double at each layer (12 / 20 / 45).

George F. Will, writing in *Time* (1998), states that the Los Angeles Times reported that in the Cal State system "almost half the freshmen need remedial work in math or English or both" (p. 84).

Leaving aside the *reasons* for these disheartening percentages one is still forced to consider the combining of underprepared or disadvantaged community college students with

> [t]he excessive reliance on part-time faculty for lower-division and community college instruction also means that entering and less well prepared students may be further disadvantaged relative to more advanced students. First, lower-division students are primarily taught by faculty members who are not remunerated to provide the out-of-class support that is particularly essential to such students. Second, the . . . adjunct . . . faculty's lack of collegial involvement or professional support makes them less knowledgeable about their employers and therefore less able to represent, orient, or respond to their students (Academe, Jan.-Feb 1998, p. 57).

Echoing the AAUP's thoughts are Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron (1995) who claim

> [t]he part-time faculty member is also most likely to wrestle with the instruction of the growing numbers of underprepared students - (which is) one of the most important and expanding missions of the community college . . . Underprepared at-risk students combine work and school; they are single parents, minorities, first-generation college students, students with economic and child care needs, students with a history of academic difficulties, or some combination of these categories . . . Quality faculty are essential to serving their needs . . . part-timers are frequently used . . . to teach the lower-level courses that full-time faculty find undesireable, and that often developmental and general education courses are the only courses part-timers are allowed to teach" (p. 17).

In a highly speculative aside, it may be that students feel towards their instructors' preparedness much the same as the instructors feel about theirs. The Chronicle of Higher Education (1998, January 16) reports on a study by the Higher Education Research Institute at the University of

California at Los Angeles that 36.0 percent of freshmen at two- and four-year institutions were "frequently bored in class" (p. A39). Student preparedness? Instructor preparedness? Or both?

Choosing of Texts

Questions 60 and 61

60. How often do you select your own course texts?

never *occasionally* *frequently* *always*

61. How often would you like to choose your course texts?

never *occasionally* *frequently* *always*

Table 46
(Questions 60 & 61; *n = 464*)
Frequency of Text Selection
and Desire to Select Own Text

	A	B	C	A/B/C
% Who Cannot Select Texts Nor Want To	9	7	9	**9**
% Who Cannot Select Texts But Want To*	51	51	43	**50**
% Who Can* Select Texts and Want To*	40	42	48	**41**

* occasionally, frequently or always

Results and Discussion

Sixty percent of the respondents are not permitted to select the texts for the courses they teach, and almost all of them would like to be able to. As well, all of those who can choose their course texts do so.

Were all community college instructors (who comprise 60 percent of faculties) to select their texts it probably would present major headaches to chairs, supervisors, and book store managers, but nonetheless the 50 percent who cannot select their texts but want to does speak to issues of academic freedom (see question 72) and classroom autonomy. Still, for some adjuncts, having someone else go through the arduous process of reviewing many books to select one is a blessing.

Problem Students

Question 62

On average, for each class that you teach, how often do you have to deal with a significant student disruption of your teaching? _____

Table 47
(Question 47; *n = 410*)
Disrupting Student Behaviors Per Semester

	A	B	C	A/B/C
% Who Report Zero or Rare Signif. Disrupt.	86	74	92	**80**
Aver. # of Disrup. For Those Who Report Disrupt.	1.7	2.7	2	**2.3**

note: It was the intention of this research to gain figures of disruptions per class *semester* ; while that word was omitted from the question, this research has confidence that all but a very few respondents assumed *semester*.

Results and Discussion

Eighty percent of the respondents answered "none," "0," "rare," etc. For the 20% of respondents who answered with 1 or more than one, the average was 2.3. College A reported 1.7 and College B reported 2.7.

With 80 percent of the respondents reporting zero or rare incidents, most adjuncts do not perceive student classroom behaviors as a major issue. However, since perhaps 20 percent of adjuncts (whose incident average is 2.3) do see a problem, some type of optional help might be made available to them.

Letters of Recommendation

Question 63

In the last year, how many letters of recommendation did you write (for students on your campus)? *0 1 2 3 4+*

Table 48

(Question 63; *n = 441*)

Letters of Recommendation Written Per Year

	A	B	C	A/B/C
% of Adjuncts Who Write Letters	49	44	43	**46**
Average # of Letters Written*	0.99	0.95	0.70	**0.96**

* by entire *n = 441*

Results and Discussion

It appears that almost half of adjuncts write approximately two letters of recommendation per year, and that the other half write none. Given that letter writing is not one of the required duties of adjuncts, these figures can be interpreted as indicators of the high level of commitment demonstrated by many adjuncts.

E. Potpourri

Fairness of Salary

Question 64

Considering only the money you are paid for teaching a course at (your college), and not considering the issue of benefits, how would you describe your pay per course?

very fair *fair* *unfair* *very unfair*

Table 49

(Question 64; *n = 461*)

Adjuncts' Opinion About the Fairness of Their Salary

	A	B	C	A/B/C
Very Fair %	3	9	4	**6**
Fair %	35	38	75	**39**
Unfair %	34	34	13	**33**
Very Unfair %	28	19	8	**22**

Table 50

(Questions 29 & 64; *n = 485 / 461*

Percentages by Type (see q. 29)

	a. hopers	*b.* retirees	*c.* f.-timers	*d.* house	*e.* grad	*f.* lancers
Very Fair	2	1	12	0	0	7
Fair	24	47	48	36	33	35
Unfair	34	34	28	32	47	39
Very Unfair	40	18	12	32	20	19

Results and Discussion

Nearly half (45 percent) of the respondents feel that the remuneration they receive is fair or very fair, and more than half (55 percent) feel it unfair or very unfair. Of note is that College C's percentages in those combinations are 79 and 23 percent.

There are no surprises when the results of question 64 are combined with those of question 29. For example, hopers are 3.3 times more likely to respond "very unfair" than full-timers and are 1/15th as likely to respond "very fair" than are full-timers.

When "very fair" and "fair" are paired, and "unfair" and "very unfair" are paired (e.g., 60 percent of full-timers feel that their remuneration is "very fair" or "fair'), and those pairings are ranked, a most-to-least "fairness hierarchy" results in the following order: 1) full-timers 2) retirees 3) free-lancers 4) house-holders 5) graduate students 6) hopers.

Gappa (1984, p. 73) cites Tuckman's 1978 study in reporting that 35.4 percent of "homeworkers" felt that their salary as a part-timer was "paid at least proportionally," which compares to the 36 percent of "householders" in this study who felt that their salary was "very fair" or "fair." Other Tuckman / current study percentage comparisons are "semi-retired, 41 / 48, "students" 26 / 33, full-timers elsewhere 32 / 60, and all categories combined 28 / 45.

Roueche, Roueche and Milliron say that "Part-timer faculty generally feel exploited when comparing their compensation with that of full-timers employed at the same college" and that "This wide variance between salaries of part-timers and full-timers has given birth to yet another issue: How can a college justify the disparity between these salaries?" (p. 13).

The AAUP (Academe, Jan.-Feb., 1998), echoes those thoughts: "Although systematic data do not exist, the typical part-time fee per course ranges from $1,000 to $3,000 - a rate generally far below, pro rata" (p. 55). The AAUP continue: "Where preparation and credentials of part-time faculty are equivalent (to full-time faculty), institutions treat and remunerate the equally qualified individuals in such grossly disparate ways as to encourage cynicism of both faculty tiers about institutional commitment to quality undergraduate teaching" (p. 57).

When the hours worked per week as reported by the AAUP's Table 5 in "Working for Academic Renewal" in this study's question #2 are combined with Table 6 of the AAUP work (which has the average professor at a public two-year college earning $25,430 per semester, compared to the approximately $500 per credit hour for the average of the two large community colleges in this study), pro rated figures are $37.73 for the full-timer and $17.79 for the part-timer, the latter of whom has no employee benefits at either institution.

Table 7 of "Working for Academic Renewal" shows NCES figures that have instructional expenditures per full-time equivalent student increasing only 0.6% for public two-year institutions between 1977 and 1993, compared with the average increase of all other types of higher-ed institutions of 22.4%. A significant amount of the credit for that comparison goes to the adjuncts, who typically comprise 65% of community college faculties, compared to approximately 30% for four-year institutions.

Mosby (1999), in a survey of 170 community colleges in 50 states found that North Carolina reported the low of $128 per credit hour at one college, and California reported the high of $1,639 (p. 7) Almost all community colleges pay between $400 and $600 per hour.

Colleges A, B and C in this study pay its adjuncts $550, $500 and $450 respectively per semester hour.

Resignation

Question 66

Is there now anything happening or not happening that would lead you to stop teaching at (your campus)? *yes no* Comments?

Table 51

(Question 66; *n = 460*)

Percentages of Those Who Might Leave the College

	A	B	C	A/B/C
% of Those Who Answered Yes*	35	31	25	**32.4**

* of those who answered yes or no

Table 52

(Question 66; *n = 150*)

Reasons Given for Possibly Quiting Adjunct Position

Reason for Leaving	Number	Reason for Leaving	Number
Poor compensation	39	Moving out of area	4
Accept any job elsewhere	21	Poor supervisor or chair	4
Wrong class time or inadeqate notice	17	Deterioration of classroom and/or equipment	3
Poorly prepared or disruptive students	11	Copiers	2
Personal (family, health, etc.)	10	Parking	2
Little or no support or loyalty	8	Retirement	2
Little or no chance of advancement	7	Complete doctoral studies	1
Class size too large	6	No/little respect or apprec.	1
Commute time	6	Other	6

Results and Discussion

Seventeen factors were mentioned by the 150 respondents who answered yes. If more than one factor was mentioned, only the first was recorded. Six factors were deemed irrelevant.

Poor compensation is the most frequent reason given for leaving a campus, and constitutes 8.5 percent of the accepted reasons. While that is not a small percentage, it does not speak to a readiness on the part of the respondents at large to tear up the cobblestones and mount the barricades with flags waving. Robert Weisbuch, President of the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation, said earlier this year that "If you want better academic jobs, you've got to be able to threaten that you'll leave academia to do X, Y, or Z. If you don't have that threat, you've got a closed economy, and you are at the mercy of amoral market forces" (Magner, 1999).

About market forces in general Gappa and Leslie (1993) said

> [a]t virtually every one of our site institutions, we were told that a surplus of people with advanced degrees in the humanities made it easier to staff lower-level courses with part-time

> faculty. These surpluses are not uniform across all fields, but the availabiltiy of many people to teach at the college level is clear . . .Part-time faculty . . . may constitute a far larger potential pool than has previously been recognized. Even if one applies stringent standards of qualifications to such a pool, it is a work force that institutions can and will tap to a greater extent in the future (p. 220).

Perhaps of more concern are the roughly one out of twenty (4.6 percent) of adjuncts who said they would take virtually any job elsewhere.

Actions Adjuncts Can Take for Improvement

Question 67

What are one or two actions adjuncts themselves can take to improve their general circumstances at (your community college)?

Table 53

(Question 67; *n = 304*)

Actions Adjuncts Can Take

Action	Number	Action	Number
Unite, rally, unionize, strike, organize, join together	60	Arrange brown-bag / p.m. (with or without f.t.ers	12
Network, interact with p.t.ers, f.t.ers and staff	50	Take advantage of prof. devel. meetings & conf.s	12
"I don't know," "I have no opinion"	42	Be more professional	11
Become proactive	38	Peer review	5
Communicate concerns to chair or provost	32	Communicate via e-mail	4
Attend meetings	20	Create newsletter	2
"Forget it," "It's hopeless"	15	Stop complaining	1

Results and Discussion

Given the overall market forces and the state laws in Maryland and Virginia it seems most unlikely that the 19.7 percent of respondents who answer "unite, rally" etc. constitute an action-oriented and viable component. But when that component of 60 is combined with the 50 in "network" and the 38 in "become proactive" their numbers increase to 148, nearly 50 percent of the respondents. Is this the "sleeping giant (that) . . . will maim higher education" that Roueche, Roueche and Milliron speak of? (1995, p. 157). Or does it speak more to the need for community? Indeed, almost all of the categories are threads in the community fabric.

Actions of Full-Timers in Support of Adjuncts

Question 68

What are one or two actions your full-time colleagues have taken to support you in your teaching?

Table 54

(Question 68; *n = 352*)

Supportive Actions Taken by Full-Time Colleagues

Actions	Number	Action	Number
Provided (via1:1's and phone) time / moral support / wisdom	119	Substituted for me	7
"None" "I don't know"	85	Kept me informed	5
Shared syllabi/notes/materialls	53	Let me choose text	5
Invited to depart. meetings	14	Shared office	4
Invited me to seminars/ workshop	12	Customizing class schedule	4
Shared pedagogy / strategies	12	Gave feedback/support on my ideas for dept. improve	4
Direct actions of chair/ dept. head	9	Gave me formal recognition	1
Treated me with respect; gave compliment	9	Provided high quality meetings for p.t.ers	1
Classroom observation	8		

Results and Discussion

Five of the first six categories are positive and comprise 60 percent of the responses. The one negative item of the six ("None - I don't know") seems at the extreme opposite of support and friendship and constitutes almost one-quarter of the respondents. Is this a public relations problem or is it intended distancing behavior?

The Most Important Improvement Department Could Make

Question 69

In what single, most important way could your department/unit improve adjuncts' teaching?

Table 55
(Question 69; *n = 248*)

Adjuncts' Ideas for Ways Department Could Improve Adjunct Teaching

Way	Number	Way	Number
Increase pro. devel. sessions	35	Increase classroom observation	7
Increase salary	35	Consult on text selection	6
Provide office / storage space	24	Eliminate 2 paycheck semesters	6
"I don't know"	21	Enforce prerequisites	5
Show respect and/or improve commo. w/memos, talk	16	Establish internet community	4
More notice of teaching sched.	13	Establish mentoring program	4
Establish generic joint meetings for p.t.ers and f.t.ers	11	Free tuition for campus courses	4
Include p.t.ers in departmental and governance meetings	11	Establish team / collaborative teaching	2
Improve copier situation	11	Pay for attendance at seminars and conferences	2
Improve intra-course articulation and academic goals	8	Improve support staff	2
Provide benefits	8	Don't segregate p.t.ers from f.t.ers	2
Have social get-to-gethers	8	Move some day meetings to eve.	2

Results and Discussion

Question 69 comes (obviously) near the end of the 72 questions, so gradual attrition can be expected. But what is of note is that question 68 got 352 "hits," one-third more than question 69. Is it because question 68 is passive and question 69 is active - it requires the respondent to participate?

Whatever the answer, the two most popular suggestions on how to improve *adjuncts' teaching* comprise the janus-faced statue of dollars and development. What ever the respondents paired it equally *with*, they again make it clear that professional growth is a high priority.

The Reasons Colleges Employ Adjuncts

Question 70

From your perspective as an adjunct, what do you think (your college) administrators see as the benefits of employing adjuncts?

Table 56

(Question 70; *n = 394*)

Reasons Adjuncts Think
College Adminstrators Employ Adjuncts

Reason	Number	Reason	Number
Save dollars / easy on budget / etc.	183	Increase flow of talent	19
Utilize real world / outside expertise	90	Terminate easily	10
Hiring flexibility	54	Exploit / take advantage of	9
Don't have to pay for benefits	29		

Results and Discussion

Of the 183 respondents in the "save dollars" category, 122 used the word "cheap," e.g., "We are cheap." Roueche, Roueche and Milliron (1995) quote McGuire using the same word: "Generally, it appears that part-time faculty are 'considered a necessary evil, rationalized as an important strategy for saving money and maintaining flexibiltiy . . . a cheap fix' " (p. 4). Gappa and Leslie (1993) cite a paper by Kekke (1983) titled "Who's Mr. Staff: Cheap Labor or Valued Resource?" (p. 191). Later still, they add that "Another refrain labels part-time vaculty 'cheap labor' and notes that saving money is the principal reason for firing them . . . These mesages reflect an institutional culture that devalues part-time faculty" (p. 263). Institutions employ part-timers for a variety of reasons. According to the AAUP (Academe, Jan.-Feb., 1998), prime among them are that part-timers are

> irresistibley cost effective, although there may be substantial hidden or indirect costs of of which to date institutions have made no account. Lowering the cost of instruction through the use of part-time appointments frees up resources that institutions can use to increase salaries and support of full-time faculty or for other educationally valuable investments . . . The growth of part-time faculty work clearly stems in largest part steady and increasing fiscal pressures on institutions . . ." (p. 56). Other institutional factors include fluctuations in enrollment, and (flexibility) to respond to changes in demand for curricular specializations (p. 56).

Rouche, Rouche, and Milliron (1995) feel that

> [f]rom the perspective of the college (as) demands on the community college to expand programs, as populations of life-long learners, part-time students, returning adults, and underprepared students swell the student roles, colleges face uneven and unexpected enrollment fluctuations . . . (combined with) state appropriation cycles and . . . shortages of faculty . . . (p. 14) . . . Part-timers offer insights from the 'real world' and emerging disciplines . . . They are in a unique position to give students a sense of current professional trends and a connection with the working world (p. 11).

Also speaking to newly emerging needs, Gappa and Leslie (1993) say that "In certain fields, institutions simply cannot keep up with changes in . . . technology" (p. 122) but that "Unfortunately, the hidden costs of employing part-time faculty are seldom factored in . . . (such as) adminstrative overhead and diversion of full-time faculty away from teaching" (p. 240).

Gappa and Leslie (1993) quote one department chair as saying "Come on, it's all about money." They continue that "Some institutions candidly acknowledge that use of part-timers serves as a fiscal buffer to protect the salaries, work load, and tenure of full-time faculty" (p. 92).

Are there elements which auger for change? Gappa (1984) says

> . . . well employed people were willing to teach part time for little money, if only because to do so confirmed their professional status. With such cheaply gotten talent, four-year colleges and universities acquired some of the flexibility of the community colleges . . . Adminstrators could provide competent instruction by part-timers at between 50 and 80 percent of the direct cost of comparable instruction by full-time faculty" p. 40).

Gappa and Leslie (1993) conclude with the thought of an adjunct: "We are underpaid, yet we pay the bills" (p. 198), a sentiment which probably speaks to the value that the American culture places on higher education.

F. FINALE

Parallel Ranking of Factors That Hinder or Enhance Teaching

Question 72

For the last question, please list the three most important factors (specific to your campus and/ or general to academia and your life) that **hinder** and **enhance** your teaching. The factors may come from this questionnaire, or from any other source, including your general impressions of the academy and the American society.

Table 57

(Question 72)

Factors Adjuncts Perceive
That Hinder and Enhance Their Teaching
(parallel ranking)

Hinder Factors (Total: 749)	Number (out of 749)	Enhance Factors (Total: 698)	Number (out of 698)
Students' . . .	**205**	**Academic Community**	**202**
inadequate preparation to take the course	104	support of f.t.ers & chair	75
		sense of community	55
poor attitude, behavior, homework	73	academicfreedom	41
cultural differences	14	respect, recognition	13
demanding schedules	14	pro. devel. activities	11
		e-mailcommunication	4
		institution-wide factors	3
Resources (inadequate)	**113**	**My Own . . .**	**169**
a / c, heat, boards, etc.	52	experience, education	67
AV, computers	29	attitude, enthusiasm	65
copiers	18	pedagogy, creativity	19
support staff	12	ind. efforts in pro. devel.	17
libraries/ labs	12	sense of humor	1
materials/ supplies	10		
nochalk	2		

Hinder Factors (cont'd)	Number (out of 749)
Academic community	**96**
no/ little respect / apprec.	27
no/ little collegiality	25
no/ little commo. w/ chair or supervisors	21
unclear dept. expect.	10
lack of pro. devel.	9
no e-mail address	2
no say in governance	2
Compensation	**81**
salary	67
benefits	7
get paid twice a semester	7
Time	**58**
not enough	47
uncompensated out-of-class duties	8
teach 3 or more campuses	3
Notice, short, of next semes.	40
Texts (poor, can't choose)	34
Class size (too large)	35
Commute time	26
Other demands	25
other (f.t.) job	19
family	6
Job insecurity/ advance.	11
Parking	4
Lack of knowledge (my own)	1

Enhance Factors (cont'd)	Number (out of 698)
Students' . . .	**167**
positive attitude, desire	121
diversity of age / cultures	26
gratitude expressed to instructor	8
evaluation of instructor	7
progress/ success	5
Resources	**74**
support staff	69
libraries, labs	38
copiers	7
Texts	**16**
high quality	15
ability to choose	1
Notice, adeq., next semes.	12
Compensation	6
Museums, guest speakers	3
Other	7

Results and Discussion

While question 72 does ask for factors that hinder and enhance, some of those entered under enhance may well belong under hinder. For example, compensation receives six "votes" under the enhance category, but it seems unlikely that respondent motivation for listing them is satisfaction. Therefore, the enhance column may also partially be viewed as a wish list, whereas the hinder column may be viewed as a gripe list.

Student issues rank first in the hinder category and third in the enhance category, and similarly, academic community issues rank third and first respectively. Resources ranks second in both categories. Restated, of the 1447 votes cast in both categories, students received 25.7 percent, academic community 20.5 percent, and resources 12.9 percent.

Survey question 72 (above) and research question 2 ("To what extent do they believe that [compensation and benefits, membership in the academic community and professional development] hinder and enhance their classroom teaching?) are the essentially the same question. Four conclusions can be drawn from Table 58's data.

First, compensation and benefits received 6.2 percent of the total vote, and is a minor factor. Second, membership in the academic community (20.5 percent of the total vote) is a significant but not dominant factor. Third, student factors (both positive and negative) get 25.7 percent of the total vote (27 percent of the hinder and 24 percent of the enhance votes). Fourth, when discrete items such as "professional development activities," "pedagogy/creativity," "experience/ education" and "attitude/ enthusiasm' are combined they form a constellation that garners 188 votes, or 13.0 percent. When combined with Table 56's data, which indicate a substantial interest in professional development, a clear message comes through. Thoughts on this arena and Chapter Four as a whole are offered in Chapter Five (Questions and Observations, One Recommendation, Limitations, and Conclusions).

"I am an invisible man . . . I am invisible,
understand, simply because people refuse to see me . . .
because of a peculiar disposition of the eyes of those with
whom I come in contact . . .

. . . I am not complaining, nor am I protesting
either . . . It is sometimes advantageous to be unseen."

Ralph Ellison, in the Prologue of *The Invisible Man.*

5. QUESTIONS AND OBSERVATIONS, ONE RECOMMENDATION, LIMITATIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS

A. Research Questions

The First and Second Research Questions

This study began by asking three questions, the first two of which were:

> How do Washington,D.C.-area community college adjuncts feel about specific elements related to their 1) compensation and benefits, 2) membership in the academic community, and 3) professional development?
>
> and
>
> To what extent do they believe that those elements hinder and enhance their classroom teaching?

Having taken a doctoral course that described many of the aspects of the typical community college adjunct instructor, and having completed the pilot project described earlier, this researcher launched this study intent on exposing the gross inequities that adjuncts receive at the hands of, at best, neglectful and uncaring administrators. This researcher expected findings that would shed more light on murky but well-known realities - part-timers are simultaneously exploited and ignored - they are to the community college, as Cohen and Brawer (1996) describe them, "as the migrant workers are to the farm" (p. 85). Another expected finding was that adjuncts in this study would demonstrate frustrations that could be marshalled to correct the ills that beset them. As Rouche, Rouche, and Milliron (1995) say, they are

> sleeping giants; their sheer numbers and their impact on college instruction cannot and should not be ignored . . . The issues will be addressed, or they will maim higher education" (p. 157).

Admittedly, this researcher's enthusiasm was not tempered by objectivity.

Wallace (1984) identifies two categories of adjuncts - contented and discontented - and then focuses on the latter. His premise is that the latter are the majority. Surprisingly, the research found contented faculty to be much closer to the norm.

Wallace's (1984) opening lines in *Part-Time Academic Employment in the Humanities* describe a contented adjunct:

> Some part-time faculty are thoroughly content. Nobody worries much about them. (They) . . . might need help finding parking spaces, grade sheets, and the copying machine, but they don't care much about getting higher salaries or fringe benefits for their part-time teaching. The dignity of a desk, coat rack, and departmental stationery; a current and complete part-time faculty handbook; a good orientation program on teaching skills for those who lack experience in the classroom; and friendly, respectful recognition from full-time faculty and staff - these are all they really need . . . This book is not about them" (p. xiii) . . . (It is about part-timers') deep frustrations, lack of voice and vote, low salaries and inadequate fringe benefits" (p. xv).

This researcher initially shared Wallace's intent, but the findings of this three-college study describe a typical adjunct who is not only reasonably content with *being* adjunct, but also views the college as adjunct to *his* life. "Hoper-takers" (those who would take a full-time job on their campus if it were available) comprise less than 17 percent of the respondents, and are therefore a distinct minority.

The typical adjunct in this study:

1. does not want a full-time teaching position at his or her college,
2. is covered by health and retirement plans,
3. teaches the number of hours on a schedule he or she prefers and has been doing so for 14 semesters over the past 8 years

4. teaches for intrinsic reasons and is not particularly exercised about the remuneration,
5. is reasonably content with his or her employer,
6. has little, if any, desire to participate in governance,
7. has very few problem students,
8. enjoys high self-esteem,
9. is almost entirely focused on the student.

It should not be concluded from the above that there are not long-standing inequities, but while some community college and other higher education administrators may be uncomfortable with some of their policies towards adjuncts, they show little, if any, motivation to change those policies - administrators appear to be comfortable with the entrenched stasis they perpetuate by default.

Adjuncts are unlikely to address policy neglect by administrators. While some small communities of adjuncts mount short-lived movements to correct some of the unfairness which they are subject to, there is little evidence that they are likely to coalesce into any national, regional, local or even campus movements. A reflection of this is seen in Table 53, which shows only 39 respondents who might quit because of poor compensation. (However, a warning might be interpreted from Table 54, which shows 98 respondents who suggest such actions as "strike, rally, become proactive." But for the time being, neglect of adjuncts appears to be a cause without a rebel.)

And even were they to rebel, there is little reason to believe that taxpayers and legislators would pay much sympathetic attention. The public does not appear to be receptive to the recitation of the woes of those who teach, let alone those who teach part-time; it is aware that many full-time educators make salaries in the $50-80,000 range for nine months of work. Never mind that full-timers are increasingly called upon to take up the myriad duties of their departed and unreplaced peers, and that part-timers receive much less than half the hourly salary that full-timers receive.

Even for those administrators who attempt to address inequities, successes are complex. Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron (1995) write that

> [c]learly, part-time faculty are a diverse group, and the various attempts to assign defining labels have failed to provide a workable vocabulary to explain who they are or their role in the institution . . . the diversity of their backgrounds and the needs of the part-timers make it difficult to design solutions that will address their disparate needs . . . studies have resulted in little more than a continuing affirmation of the notion that part-time faculty area common response to uncertainty (p. 8).

In a longer-range view, the two-decades-long policy shift of higher education administrators to the increasing use of part-timers is disturbing. It may be that what is fundamentally at issue is the evisceration of the academy. Schuster (1998) warns

> [i]f academic appointments and careers continue to evolve toward a more contingent academic labor force, will the academic profession become less able to attract high-quality people? Probably so. [I]f modest compensation, lengthy and costly career preparation, spotty prospects for a regular appointment . . . loom even larger . . . the consequences . . . will (be a) diver(sion) . . . of highly able, career-minded undergraduates . . . [I]t follows that society has a significant stake in the abilty of colleges and universities to attract . . . the best and brightest . . . the price for not (doing so) will be high (p. 52).

In an even broader sense, an element that is seldom, if ever, discussed but nonetheless may be as salient as administration policies and legislative "show-me" attitudes and tax-payer priorities, is one of inherent societal inevitabiltiy, if not necessity. "Part-timer," "adjunct," "auxiliary," "ancillary," "apprentice" are words that lack relative substance or full participation. They apply to those who are early in the process of climbing the ladder, or who want desperately to climb the ladder but do not seem quite built for the job. Other jobs, yes, but not *that* job. No word in English confers respect and prestige to those who are engaged part-time. At the top of the ladder words that are applied to those who are less than full-time are words of status and respect, like "emeritus." Is there not a necessary and ancient zone in human endeavors in all arenas that serves the vital function of training and weeding out? If so, is that zone intrinsically unfair to those adjuncts who prefer to teach part-time and teach because they love to transmit their subject? And is it even unfair to the "hoper-takers" on the ladder who are qualified for full-time positions but simply must put in the time that the process requires?

These question aside, the above nine attitudes of this study's typical adjunct, combined with Table 58's hindrance and enhancement of classroom teaching, clearly show that for a significant number of adjuncts, community membership, and professional development are the prime issues.

This study begins with a quote from the first paragraph of Ralph Ellison prologue in his *Invisible Man* (1947): "I am an invisible man . . . I am invisible, understand, simply because people refuse to see me. . . because of a peculiar disposition of the eyes of those with whom I come in contact." Mr. Ellison continues in the second paragraph: "I am not complaining, nor am I protesting either . . . It is sometimes advantageous to be unseen." It would seem that Mr. Ellison and many adjuncts are kindred spirits, at least at the moment.

On the other hand, this study identified a very significant subgroup of adjuncts who do wish to be seen.

Three things can be said about one quarter of part-timers in this study: they work for intrinsic rewards, are reasonably content with their salaries, and are very interested in professional development and membership in the academic community. Administrators who respond to the primacy of desires of this group and members of the group who follow up on their desires for professional growth can be of great service to the student.

B. The Third Research Question,
the 49th Survey Question,
and One Recommendation

pedagogy *n.* 1: INSTRUCTION 2: the art, science or profession of teaching; *esp:* the study that deals with principles and methods in formal education. *Webster's New International Dictionary* (1986)

[1]**peer** *adj* 1a: one is that of the same or equal standing with another : EQUAL <scholars of the first rank welcomed him as their ~ - B.W. Bond> *Webster's New International Dictionary*

mentor *n* [after *Mentor,* tutor of Telemachus in the Odyssey of Homer] 1: a close, trusted and experienced counselor or guide <everyone of us needs a ~ who . . . can hold up a mirror to us - P.W. Keeve> *Webster's New International Dictionary*

gestalt *n* 1: a structure of . . . psychological phenomena so integrated as to constitute a functional unit with properties not derivable from its parts in summation *Webster's New International Dictionary*

The third research question this study asks is

> What specific actions can be designed and implemented to lessen or enhance those factors?

According to the responses to survey question 49 (Table 38) - "To what extent would you agree with an on-going program of peer mentoring, including exchange of classroom visits?" - one quarter of adjuncts wish to be seen in the professional development arena - they wish to actively participate in an "on-going program of peer mentoring" that would include exchange of classroom visits.

Thus, the answers to the first element (compensation/benefits) of the first research question are that almost all adjuncts teach largely for intrinisic values, are covered by health and retirement plans from other sources, and have little interest in college-sponsored coverage. Compensation and benefits appear not to affect their classroom teaching. Unfair it is, but it is a cause without a rebel.

However, the answers to the second and third elements (membership in the academic community and professional development) of the first two research questions are issues about which adjuncts feel strongly.

Moreover, the two are not only closely related in responses, but in possible solutions (research question three) as well. While adjuncts typically express little or no desire for involvement in governance, they apparently view community membership as a different domain, because almost all want to be more connected to their peers. As mentioned, one quarter say they have real interest in a community of peers devoted solely to professional development.

Opportunities for development of teaching skills are rare for full-time or adjunct faculty. The American community college has long portrayed itself as the paramount place of teaching and of responsive flexibility. The maxims are heard and read many times in many forums. Yet, given the ubiquity of statements on the primacy of pedagogy in community colleges, why is it that generally there is so little departmental, campus and institutional investment in the improvement of the art of teaching?

"Faculty development remains one of the least prominent budget items in the majority of American (community) colleges" and even when it is funded for adjuncts, the responsibility for its execution is most often assigned to part-time faculty department chairs or faculty, which results in uneven interest and involvement (Coehn and Brawer, 1996, p. 83).

Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron (1995) point out that part-time faculty are the least likely to receive organizational support to improve their pedagogy (p. 15).

Neglect of professional development undoubtedly has an impact on the quality of teaching. It may explain why Derek Bok (1993) said "College instruction remains among the small cluster of human activities that do not grow demonstrably better over time" (p. 170).

Einstein concluded cynically, "It is in fact nothing short of a miracle that the modern methods of instruction have not yet entirely strangled the holy curiousity of inquiry" (cited in Restack, 1999).

It is not just the institutions who are at fault in this arena of professional development. In 1996 the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), a union that represents many adjuncts in higher education, issued its "Statement on Part-time Faculty Employment," which was prepared by the AFT Higher Education Program and Policy Council Task Force on Part-time Faculty (Stollar, 1996). The 13-page statement covers dozens of comprehensive aspects of teaching part-time in higher education and concludes with a long list of recommendations, but professional development or improvement of classroom teaching is not mentioned.

It seems inconsistent that institutions which believe interactive group dynamics are the best way for individuals to gain knowledge and improve skills fail to use that same construct to develop teachers- the people who are in charge of the classroom. It is as if institutions were saying "We believe that nutrition and good food are crucial for good health but let's starve the chefs."

Northern Virginia Community College's 1996-97 Faculty Handbook states that

> [t]he College believes that the professional development of each faculty member is essential in the continuing improvement of its service to the community and the accomplishment of its goals. Accordingly, the College both supports policies and procedures leading to professional development . . . (p. 6-54).

As mentioned in Chapter 4 (Table 37, questions 46 and 47) of this study, of NVCC's $81 million annual budget, perhaps $10,000 is invested in improv- ing instructors' classroom skills, which perhaps is an example of why Cohen and Brawer (1996) say "[f]aculty development remains one of the least prominent budget items in the majority of American (community) colleges" (p. 83).

The answer to the third research question is imbedded in an extended answer to survey question 49 (Table 38): To what extent would you agree with an on-going program of peer mentoring (including and exchange of classroom visits)?

The 49th survey question is "To what extent would you agree with an on-going program of peer mentoring (including classroom visits)?"

The past 25 years has brought a "curious mix of advantages and disadvantages" for adjuncts (Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron, 1995, p. 8). If that is the case, it is not for want of recommendations. The literature is complete with lists of what various factions should do and should not do. The lists' effect upon the academy is unclear.

This research desires to make a simple suggestion which all concerned would find positive, inexpensive, viable, of interest to instructors, and easy to put in place without disruption. The suggestion is to respond to those numerous academes who so clearly wish to be party to a program of individual change benefiting the instructor, the college, and, most of all, the *raison d'etre* of the institutions, the student. The suggestion embraces the most fundamental aspect of education - inquiry. The inquiry would ask: "What in my teaching works well and how can I improve it, and what in my teaching does not work well, and how can I correct it?"

Thirty-eight percent of the respondents supported mandatory professional development totally or quite a bit (question 48, Table 38) and twenty-four percent supported peer development with exchange of classroom visits totally or quite a bit (question 49, Table 38). These responses are manifestations of a cohort that desires to enter the most fundamental domains of education - inquiry of self and change of self in a communal setting. Fully one quarter of the community college adjuncts in Washington, D.C. are telling one another, department chairs, deans, provosts and presidents, "I'm good, I love teaching, *and* I want to get better!" That is a powerful statement *and* an invitation to the community colleges of this study, and perhaps to the academy at large.

Cohen and Brawer (1996) state

> [a] professionalized community college faculty organized around the discipline of instruction might well suit the community college . . . Teaching has always been the hallmark of . . . (community) colleges; a corps of professionalized instructors could do nothing but enhanceit (p. 97).

C. Peer Mentoring Gestalts

The academy is replete with ideas on how to fix things. For example, The Conference on the Growing Use of Part-Time and Adjunct Faculty in Washington, D.C. in 1997 (Academe, 1998) issued 16 "guidelines for good practice" (which, on page 58, included "Provision of orientation, mentoring, and professional support and development opportunities) and 18 "actions to encourage implementation of good practices" (p. 59). And together, Gappa and Leslie (1993) and Roueche, Roueche and Milliron (1995) end their treatises with 53 recommendations. For those wishing more quantity specific to the improvement of classroom skills, the ninth chapter of Pam Cooper's (1995) fifth edition of "Communication for the Classroom Teacher," offers 21 lists of 401 items on how to be an effective instructor.

Based on the findings of this survey my simple recommendation is that community colleges establish peer mentor gestalts (PMGs) for the quarter of adjuncts and the unknown but certainly considerable percentage of full-timers who wish professional growth via peer mentoring so that they may better serve the student. A peer mentor gestalt would not be connected officially or *de facto* to instructor evaluation - if it is seen as anything other than a totally voluntary vehicle for personal and professional change without external encumbrances, it will be suspect and its value will be diminished.

Further, "peer" would be used in the spirit of the above definition. All PMG members would be of equal standing with one another. "Peer" is often misused in the academy. For example, Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron (1995) say that "Peer evaluation (of all part-time staff by a) full-time certificated staff . . . evaluator . . . are schedule(d) (by) division chairs . . ." (p.142). If it is truly a peer evaluation, why are new full-timers not evaluated by veteran part-timers?

The underlying philosophy of a peer mentoring program would best include a non-hierarchical, totally egalitarian structure. There would be no "new hires," "veterans," "full-timers," "adjuncts," "proteges," "mentees," "tutees," or any other -tees from which superiority or inferiority could be inferred. All members of a peer mentoring gestalt, no matter their experience or manifested talents and/or relative weaknesses and strengths, would be viewed by all other members as possessors of curiosity, adventuresomeness, and desire for excellence through personal and group change. All peer mentors would be fully capable of bringing to the gestalt questions, problems, hopes, strengths, defeats and victories.

"Collegial research and enhancement of personal and professional skills in service to the student in the classroom" would perhaps be the bedrock philosophy - the motto - of such a group.

The literature has many models and guidelines for peer mentoring, including those mentioned in this section. Rather than present a model with specific elements, I offer what might be considered the three essential elements of a PMG: 1) self-evaluation and introspection 2) exchanged classroom visits with peers and student evaluations 3) dialogue and communication with peers . While much of the gaining of evidence of one's teaching competence comes from fellow faculty and the students one teaches, the most crucial element is the desire to candidly and fully appraise oneself through the offices of others *and* through offering one's own perceptions and ideas.

Self-evaluation Via Teaching Portfolios

Higher education generally does not see teaching as a "subject worthy of intellectual discussion and study" (American Association of Higher Education, 1991, p. i) The teaching portfolio as a vehicle for the research of the scholarship of teaching has enjoyed some increased use of late, and can be a great advantage in documenting the process of change. A teaching portfolio is fundamentally a "selective account . . . of what is unique about an individual's approach to teaching" (p. 4). It can be, of course, privy only to its author, but also can be used as a vehicle for representing oneself to current or prospective employers, or to current and future fellow members of a PMG. It would be well, however, to keep clear the demarcation between exposition and promotion.

Whether forever private or not, categories of evidence facilitate the keeping and reading of it. Typical categories are 1) products of good teaching (e.g., student achievements such as scores and awards) 2) material from oneself (e.g., descriptions of teaching practices and steps taken to improve them) and 3) information from others (student and classroom evaluations).

The starting point of a portfolio is the detailed answering of fundamental questions (some of the following elements are adapted from an evaluation/ development program at Cuesta College in California (Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron, p. 140), and from Peter Seldin's *The Teaching Portfolio* (1996):

- Why do I teach?
- What are my specific teaching strengths?
- In what aspects of my teaching have I been particularly successful?
- What are my specific teaching weaknesses?
- In what areas of my teaching am I not satisfied?
- What are my specific immediate goals this semester as an instructor? How do I propose to accomplish them? How will I know to what extent I have achieved these goals?
- What are my specific long-term goals as an instructor? How do I propose to accomplish them? How will I know to what extent I have achieved these goals?
- What are the specific principle activities of my job?
- Do I want the college to assist me in my goals? If yes, in whatt specific ways?
- What are the frustrations in teaching?

A number of sources are available for aiding in the use of portfolios. The aforementioned American Association of Higher Education's *The Teaching Portfolio* serves very well, as does the Seldin work.

Student Evaluations and Exchange of Classroom Visits

As mentioned earlier, student evaluations, when used correctly, are a quick and valid source of information. Faculty are more accustomed to semester-end application of student evaluations, but they can be used well during the course of the semester as a check on attitudes and progress. Subjects to be researched are virtually unlimited, but can include specific exercises, homework, and even new teaching techniques. Survey instruments can appear to be informal and non-threatening to the student by using rankings such as:

5 It is one of my favorites!
4 It is useful and I like it
3 It is OK
2 It is not very useful and I don't like it
1 I hate it!

Dialogue / Communication with Peers

> Tell me, good Brutus, can you see your face?
> No, Cassius, for the eye sees not itself
> But by reflection, by some other things . . .
> (*Julius Caesar*, Act I, Scene II).

PMG's can not only improve pedagogy, but simultaneously can also improve a sense of membership in the community. Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron (1995) state that "*faculty development* and *integration* . . . are so often intertwined that it is impossible to separate them" (p. 82). Restated, professional development *is* integretion, *is* community.

As demonstrated by the data generated by questions 34 and 35 (membership in the professional community) and 37 (interactions with fellow adjuncts) of this study's questionnaire, many adjuncts move about campus in virtual isolation. For example, 45 percent of College B's adjuncts had no significant interactions with fellow adjuncts. No doubt that is the preference for some of those adjuncts, but certainly others feel a need for it. A peer mentoring gestalt that meets regularly could well be a magnate that would attract a significant number of instructors, adjuncts and full-timers alike. In addition, communication and membership could be maintained via an e-mail group and newsletter.

> "That is, Mentor in the *Odyssey* did not so
> much tell Telemachus what to do as give him
> the courage to do it, so the teacher/mentor will
> let the student voice his or her hopes and doubts
> and conflicts and directions." (Eble, 1988, p. 111).

Eble's thoughts, though intended for the teacher/student relationship, translate well to peer mentoring, because the essence of a peer mentoring gestalt is that all are co-equal mentors *and* students.

As to the fusion of part- and full-timers, Cohen and Brawer (1996) state that they "respond similarly to faculty development activities" (p. 90). One would find it difficult to imagine of a more trusting, risk-taking, and compatible group than those who have volunteered to open up their classrooms and their psyches in order to grow.

While specific methodology programs could, of course, be meat at the table of sharing mentors, it is possible, or even probable that much of the discourse would be generic in nature.

> " ' . . .there is no measurable difference among truly distinctive methods of college instruction when evaluated by student performance on final examinations' " (Dubin and Taveggia as quoted by Cohen and Brawer, 1996, p. 184).

In conclusion, the Commission on the Future of Community Colleges, part of The American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (1988) stated "The term *community* should be defined not only as a region to be served, but also as a climate to be created" (p. 3). PMG's could aid greatly in that enhancement of the academic community.

D. Limitations

These three community colleges might not be representative of others, and the respondents might hold different attitudes from non-respondents. This is always an issue in survey research, paticularly non-national surveys. The problem is complicated by the fact that my research design precluded me from obtaining demographic or other data from non-respondents. Certainly a broader study is needed. But respondents appear to have the same profile as counterparts nationally and locally on those variable likely to cause opinion differences

Other limitations are consistent with field research. Of the approximately 1,847 questionnaires distributed to the on-campus mailboxes of virtually all of the then currently teaching adjuncts on the eleven campuses of the three colleges, 486 were wholly or partially answered and then returned, for a usable response percentage of 26.3 percent. Nine were unusable.

Questions of the validity of the research can be raised, particularly to the question of to what degree the particularly disgruntled adjuncts chose not to respond. It is clear, however, that in a large number of aspects this study parallels other studies, and data from the studied institutions.

The following are examples of similarities and parallels:

- the response rate of males and females and NVCC's adjunct employment figures differ by less than 8 percent (Table 1)
- NCES data for hours taught and class prep time differ by 13 percent (Tables 3, 4, & 5.
- Dept. of Education racial distribution figures and this study's differ by 0.9 percent (Table 15)
- NVCC's figures on average age differ by 1.3 years (Table 16)
- NSOPF marital status figures are identical for males and differ by 8 percent for females (Table 15)
- it is likely that females with doctorates were more likely to respond (Table 18)
- Table 22's data on the categories of adjuncts is close to a variety of sources (including Tuckman and Montgomery College).

Further, none of this study's data radically departs with the literature.

A primary concern was that shared with Gappa and Leslie (1993): "One of the principal difficulties we and other investigators have had is gaining access to information about part-time faculty because the institutions themselves do not have it" (p. 237). Therefore, comparison and contrast was limited.

E. Conclusions

This study was begun with the expectation that it would confirm the prevalent beliefs that adjunct instructors are a discontented lot ripe for the pro-active addressing of their occupancy of the lower level of the two-tier system that community college administrators perputuate. It concludes that the large majority of part-timers at the three colleges in the study are either employed full-time elsewhere or do not seek full-time employment at their college, are covered by medical and retirement plans, are very positive about their classroom teaching, have little if any desire and time for department or campus politics, and view their college teaching as an intrinsic adjunct to their lives and as a service to the community.

The study finds, on the other hand, that one-fourth of adjuncts have a desire to engage with peers in an effort to improve their teaching skills. This researcher's conclusion is that this subgroup provides administrators a great opportuity to improve the satisfaction and the performance of adjuncts and full-timers alike. The fusion of part- and full-timers into an on-going community (a peer mentoring gestalt) whose members would research their own pedagogy would meet a number of needs and would work for five reasons.

First, "only people who were currently engaged in instruction (can) understand the way instructors feel. Recommendations about . . . teaching . . .coming from . . . administrators . . . can be ignored (Cohen and Brawer, 1996, p. 92). In a word, autonomy.

Second, "In an age of science, the "art" of teaching must be respected, but the science of pedagogy is becoming more sensitive, adaptable, and precise (Miller, as cited by Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron, 1995, p. 124). In a word, research.

Third, "We contend that learners sit on both sides of the teacher's desk" (Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron, 1995, p. 120). In a word, humility, humility defined as knowledge of self.

Fourth, Gappa (1984) says that the principal obstacles in administering development programs are lack of staff, financial constraints, lack of interest by part-time faculty, and difficulty in finding a suitable time to present programs (p. 88). In a word, money. The PMG is a simple, inexpensive model that avoids the obstacles mentioned by Gappa. Self-selected, motivated people focused on getting better is not a complicated model. It may not be easy all the time, but it is not complicated. Change - getting better - cannot occur without self-examination, and it is a pale education that does not include self-examination.

Finally, and foremost, meeting adjuncts' explicitly expressed needs for greater membership in the academic community of their college and enhanced classroom skills can make them better teachers. In a word, education.

APPENDIX A

Cover Letters to Questionnaire from College Presidents

MONTGOMERY COLLEGE
Office of the President

September 1, 1998

MEMORANDUM

To: Adjunct Faculty

From: Robert E. Parilla, President

Subject: Survey of Adjunct Faculty

Enclosed is a survey which seeks information about the needs of adjunct faculty. Mr. John Huffman, a doctoral student in the National Center for Community College Education Program at George Mason University and an adjunct faculty member at Montgomery College, is conducting this survey as part of his dissertation research on the role of adjunct faculty.

Mr. Huffman will be sharing the results of his research with Montgomery College. Please take a few minutes to respond to the attached questionnaire. The time you spend will be minimal but your responses will assist greatly in identifying adjunct faculty needs. Mr. Huffman has provided his phone number to you if you have questions or if you would like to participate further.

The Provosts join me in thanking you for your assistance to Mr. Huffman.

REP/jab

Enclosure

NORTHERN VIRGINIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

office of the president

July 16, 1998

Dear Adjunct Faculty Member:

To better understand and provide for the needs of adjunct faculty at Northern Virginia Community College (NVCC), we have been working with John Huffman, a doctoral student at George Mason University in the National Center for Community College Education Program. He has devoted his dissertation research exclusively to the role of adjunct faculty. We are supportive of his efforts and feel that anything we at NVCC can do to assist him will benefit both him and the college.

Toward that end, please take a few moments and respond to the attached questionnaire. The time you spend will be minimal but your responses will assist greatly in identifying adjunct faculty needs. Mr. Huffman has provided his phone number to you if you would like to participate further.

Thank you, in advance, for assisting in this most important endeavor.

Sincerely yours,

Belle S. Wheelan
Belle S. Wheelan
President

Richard J. Ernst
Richard J. Ernst
President Emeritus

Southside Virginia Community College
Christanna Campus ◦ 109 Campus Drive, Alberta, VA 23821
804-949-1000 ◦ Fax: 804-949-7863 ◦ V/TDD: 804-949-7681

November 18, 1998

Dear Adjunct Faculty:

The enclosed survey gathers information on adjunct faculty for a research project sanctioned by the National Center for Community College Education at George Mason University. The author is attempting to paint an accurate portrait of the hard-working, versatile part-time faculty in the community college. If you would provide the requested information and return the survey form in the enclosed envelope, you will be contributing to an effort that could benefit faculty, students, and administrators.

Sincerely,

John J. Cavan
President

APPENDIX B
Example of Cover Letter to Questionnaire from Research

National Center for
Community College Education
George Mason University, 1B3
Fairfax, Virginia 22030-4444

September 15, 1998

Dear NVCC Adjunct, (Manassas) Campus

Like you, I am Virginia community college adjunct instructor - specifically, at the Northern Virginia C.C. Annandale and Alexandria campuses, where I have taught for five years. I am also a doctoral candidate performing research under the aegis of The National Center for Community College Education (NCCCE) and the Communication Department at George Mason University. We know that you and adjunct faculty members around the nation are important players in the delivery of high-quality instruction.

NCCCE wishes to gain current and comprehensive knowledge of adjunct faculty. This attached doctoral dissertation questionnaire and my research gather and report on the opinions, concerns and strengths of part-time faculty at SVCC, NVCC. and Montgomery (community) College in Maryland.

Mail your questionnaire directly to me here at G.M.U. in the attached postage pre-paid envelope. Your candid responses are vital. All questionnaires will be permanently and solely under my control, and will remain anonymous and confidential. Your permanent anonymity is assured; therefore, there are no risks. Your participation is voluntary, and there is no penalty for not participating. As well, there are no costs to you - I pay the return postage. Upon completion of the project the findings (but not the questionnaires) will be available to everyone.

This research project has been reviewed according to G.M.U. procedures. If you have any questions or comments, please contact me or either of my supervisors: Dr. Don Boileau @ (703) 993-1090 or Dr. Gilbert Coleman, (703) 993-2310. You may also contact the G.M.U. Office of Sponsored Programs at (703) 993-2295 regarding your rights as a participant in this research.

Return your questionnaire to me at G.M.U. in the next ten days or so, but please, by the end of November. If you receive more than one copy because you teach at more than one SVCC campus, please respond to just one and discard the other(s).

We know your time is valuable; so are your thoughts. Thank you.

John Huffman

GMU: (703) 993-2310 jhuffman@gmu.edu home: (301) 929-0000

APPENDIX C
George Mason University Permission to Conduct Research

George Mason University

4400 University Drive
Fairfax, Virginia 22030-4444

(703) 993-1000
TDD: (703) 993-1002

August 17, 1998

MEMORANDUM

TO: John Huffman
Communication/NCCCE

FROM: Margaret Hanson
Institutional Review Board Coordinator

SUBJECT: Nature of Employment

LOG NO: 2510

Under George Mason University (GMU) procedures, the above cited research project is exempt from review by the GMU Human Subjects Review Board (HRSB) since it falls under the DHHS Exempt Category 2. Please note that any further modification in your protocol requires review by this office.

Please note that any adverse effects on participants or data confidentiality and/or any modification in your protocol must be reported to the GMU Office of Sponsored Programs. GMU is bound by the ethical principles and guidelines for the protection of human subjects in research contained in The Belmont Report. Even though your data collection procedures are exempt from review by the GMU HRSB, GMU expects you to conduct your research according to the professional standards in your discipline and the ethical guidelines mandated by federal regulations.

Thank you for cooperating with the University by submitting your research project for review. Please call me at 703/993-2292 if you have any questions.

cc: Dr. Don Boileau
Dr. Gilbert Coleman

APPENDIX D
The Questionnaire

For each question please circle an *italicized* answer and/or fill in the blank with your own words and numbers. Please keep in mind that all of your answers are confidential and of great value in our research here at NCCCE.

NATURE OF EMPLOYMENT

1. In what primary discipline or program do you teach?

____

2. How many semester hours are you teaching this semester at Southside Virginia C.C.? ___ Other institutions? ___

3. Ideally, how many hours would you like to teach as a part-timer at Southside Virginia C.C (SVCC)? ___

4. Including this current fall semester of '98, how many semesters have you taught at SVCC (all campuses)? ____

5. At SVCC do you teach primarily in/on the
mornings *afternoons* *evenings* *weekends* ?

6. How many other institutions other than SSVCC are you teaching at this Fall '98 semester? _____

7. What is the maximum number of campuses (all institutions) that you have taught at in any semester in the past two years? _____

8. From fall '97 through the spring '98 at all institutions, how many total semester hours did you teach? ____

9. For the summer of '98 how many semester hours did you teach (all institutions)? ____

10. During the past academic year, how many campuses (all institutions) did you teach at? ____

11. Since you first began teaching in post-secondary education, how many years you have taught as an adjunct (all institutions)? ____

12. *a. Male* *b. Female*

13. *a. African-American* *b. Asian* *c. Hispanic*
d. White *e.* ________________

14. Age: ___

15. *Single* *Married* *Separated*

16. Do you have the use of an internet e-mail address? *yes* *no*

17. What is the highest degree that you hold? (circle one):
a. High School Diploma *b.* Associate's Degree
c. Bachelor's Degree *d.* Master's Degree
e. Master's+ _______ hours *f.* Doctorate

18. Are you currently enrolled in a program of study? *yes* *no*

19. If yes, what degree/certificate will you receive?

____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

20. Please rate these academic support services at SVCC:

	Excellent	Good	Adequate	Poor	No Opinion
Copying	____	____	____	____	____
Office Space	____	____	____	____	____
Audio/Visual	____	____	____	____	____
Classroom	____	____	____	____	____
Parking	____	____	____	____	____
Access to Campus Recreation Facil	____	____	____	____	____
Library (incl. Access)	____	____	____	____	____
Technology Access	____	____	____	____	____

21. Are you covered by any health insurance plan? *yes* *no*

22. Who provides the plan? *another job* *individual policy* *spouse's employer* *other*

23. If unsubsidized health insurance were available at SVCC, would you pay to participate? *yes* *no*

24. What retirement plan(s) do you have?

Social Security *IRA* *other* ________________________

25. If an unsubsidized retirement plan were available at SVCC, might you buy into it? *yes* *no*

26. How many hours per week do you spend in commuting to all classes that you teach on all campuses? _____

27. How much do you feel that SVCC attempts to offer you classes and schedules that are adapted to your needs?

never/rarely *sometimes* *frequently* *always*

28. Are you usually given informal notice of probable reemployment for the next semester? *yes* *no*

29. Circle the one that best describes you, *a*, *b*, *c*, *d*, *e* or *f*:

- *a)* Employed as an adjunct and hoping to get a full-time academic position nearby or elsewhere.
- *b)* Semi-retired from either a full-time teaching or non-teaching career.
- *c)* Employed permanently in a non-academic full-time job and teaching part-time at SVCC.
- *d)* Primarily responsible for running a household.
- *e)* Primarily a graduate student earning a degree.
- *f)* Free-lancer, by choice, not seeking full-time job.

30. To describe your motivation for teaching, what percentage do you teach for financial reasons, and what percentage do you teach for intrinsic values?

financial ____% intrinsic ____ % (should total 100%)

31. If a full-time teaching job at SVCC (any campus) became available, would you take it?

    definitely ***probably*** ***maybe*** ***no***

32. Would you move out of the area to accept a full-time job?

    yes ***no***

33. Overall, as an employee, how would you describe your association with SVCC as an employer?

    very satisfying ***somewhat satisfying*** ***rarely satisfying*** ***never satisfying*** ***no opinion***

PEERS, THE CHAIR, AND THE COMMUNITY

34. How much do you feel like a member of the SVCC professional community?

    totally ***quite a bit*** ***somewhat*** ***not at all***

35. What is the level at which you would prefer to feel like a member of the SVCC professional community?

    totally ***quite a bit*** ***somewhat*** ***not at all***

36. How many times per semester do you typically meet with your supervisor and/or team leader? _____

37. How many times per semester do you have significant interactions with fellow adjuncts about academic matters? _____

38. How many times each semester does your department/unit show its appreciation for your work? _____

39. How effective is the communication of your department/unit's full-time faculty and support staff with you?

    extremely effective ***quite effective*** ***marginally effective*** ***not at all effective***

40. How much desire do you have to participate in departmental governance?

    none at all ***very little*** ***some*** ***quite a bit***

41. If an on-line community of department peers were available, would you participate? ***yes*** ***no***

EVALUATION AND DEVELOPMENT

42. How frequently are your students given instructor evaluation forms at the end of the semester?

    always ***frequently*** ***infrequently*** ***never***

43. Does your department inform you of the results? ***yes*** ***no***

44. How valuable are those student evaluations for developing your classroom effectiveness?

    very ***moderately*** ***marginally*** ***not at all***

45. For professional development sessions are you generally available in/on the:

    daytime? ***yes*** ***no*** evening? ***yes*** ***no*** weekend? ***yes*** ***no***

46. In the past two years, how many professional development meetings have you attended at SVCC? *0 1 2 3 4 5+*

47. How many have been made available to you? *0 1 2 3 4 5+*

48. To what extent would you agree with a policy that requires all SSVCC adjuncts and full-timers to attend at least one professional development session per semester?

    totally ***quite a bit*** ***somewhat*** ***opposed***

49. To what extent would you agree with an on-going program of peer mentoring (including exchange of classroom visits)?

    not at all ***somewhat*** ***quite a bit*** ***totally***

50. In the past two years at SVCC, how many times have you been invited to attend departmental meetings? *0 1 2 3 4 5+*

51. How many off-campus educational conventions/seminars have you attended in the past two years? *0 1 2 3 4 5+*

    Were you reimbursed by SVCC partly or wholly? ***yes*** ***no***

52. In the past two years at SVCC, how many times have you been observed in your classroom by a peer or supervisor? *0 1 2 3 4+*

    Was the feedback? ***in person*** ***in writing*** ***both***

53. How much of the feedback that you received from the observer(s) after classroom observation were you able to use?

    most of it ***some of it*** ***very little*** ***none***

54. In the past two years, how many research papers have you published or presented to a convention/seminar? *0 1 2 3 4*

STUDENTS AND THE CLASSROOM

55. How many hours per week outside of class do you typically devote to each course you teach at SVCC? ____

56. What type of exam(s) do you tend to give?

    a. Scantron (T-F, multiple choice) *b.* *essay*

    c. fill-in-the-blank *d.* short answer

57. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 representing never and 5 representing all of the time, how much of the time do you enjoy classroom teaching? *1 2 3 4 5*

58. How academically prepared for your classes is your average student?

    very prepared ***adequately prepared*** ***marginally prepared*** ***poorly prepared*** ***not prepared***

59. How do you rank your own teaching effectiveness?

    excellent ***above average*** ***average*** ***below average***

60. How often do you select your own course texts?

    never ***occassionally*** ***frequently*** ***always***

61. How often would you like to choose your course texts?

    never ***occassionally*** ***frequently*** ***always***

62. On average, for each class that you teach at SVCC, how often do you have to deal with a significant student disruption of your teaching? ____

63. In the last year, how many letters of recommendation did you write as a SSVCC professor for SVCC students? *0 1 2 3 4+*

POTPOURRI

64. Considering only the money you are paid for teaching a course at SVCC, and not considering the issue of benefits, how would you describe your pay per course?
very fair *fair* *unfair* *very unfair*

65. When you compare the overall classroom effectiveness of adjuncts with the overall classroom effectiveness of full-timers, which do you think adjuncts are?
less effective *as effective* *more effective* *no opinion*

66. Is there now anything happening or not happening that would lead you to stop teaching at SVCC? *yes* *no*
comments

67. What are one or two actions adjuncts themselves can take to improve their general circumstances at SSVCC?

68. What are one or two actions your full-time colleagues have taken to support you in your teaching?

69. In what single, most important way could your department/unit improve adjuncts' teaching?

70. From your perspective as an adjunct, what do you think SVCC administrators see as the benefits of employing adjuncts?

71. **What aspects of teaching do you find the most rewarding?**

FINALE

72. **For the last question, please list the three most important factors (specific to SVCC and/or general to academia and your life) that hinder and enhance your teaching. The factors may come from this questionnaire, or from any other source, including your general impressions of the academy and the American society.**

THE THREE MOST IMPORTANT FACTORS THAT ***HINDER*** YOUR TEACHING:

1. ______________________________

____

2. ______________________________

____

3. ______________________________

____

THREE FACTORS THAT ***ENHANCE*** YOUR TEACHING:

1. ______________________________

____

2. ______________________________

____

3. ______________________________

____

Questions/comments/suggestions?

Do you wish to participate in a focus group?
Call John Huffman @ (301)-929-0000

Thank you very much for your time and thoughts.

APPENDIX E
List of Tables and Subjects

Table	Page	Subject
1	31	percentage and numbers of humanities/ non-humanities + male/ female
2	32	average hours taught: humanities/ non-humanities & male/ female
3	33	average instructional hours fall '98
4	33	average instructional hours fall ' 97- spring '98
5	33	average preparation hours per course per week
6	34	percentage of adjuncts who teach 23+ hours & average of those hours
7	35	ideal number of hours adjuncts would like to teach taught and percentage that teach those optimum hours, and more and less than that optimum
8	36	longevity of employment in semesters (male and female)
9	37	longevity of employment in years (humanities/ non-hum & male/ female)
10	38	part of day taught in (morning, afternoon, evenings, mix, weekends)
11	39	percentages who teach at 1-4 institutions, fall '98
12	39	percentages who teach at 1-4 campuses in past ('98-'98) academic year
13	40	average number of hours taught in summer '98
14	40	percentage that did not teach summer '98
15	40	percentage of racial minorities
16	41	average ages
17	42	marital status
18	43	percentages of various degrees earned
19	44	percentages covered by health insurance (plus mention of retirement plans)
20	46	commuting (average hours)
21	47	department attempts to adapt to your schedule
22	48	taxonomy of types with percentages (hoper-takers, free-lancers, etc.)
23	50	financial / intrinsic reasons for teaching
24	52	satisisfaction with employer
25	53	interactions with fellow adjuncts
26	54	meetings with supervisor/ chair

Table	Page	Subject
27	54	commumication effecttiveness of full-timers
28	56	levels of membership in community (perceived and preferred)
29	58	e-mail & percentages that would participate in electronic community
30	58	demonstrated appreciation by department
31	59	desire for role in governance
32	61	invitations to department meetings
33	62	freq. of student evaluations and percentage of adjuncts that are not given results
34	62	value of student evaluations
35	63	classroom observations
36	64	usefulness of classroom observation feedback
37	66	professional development opportunities/ attendance/ utilization
38	69	attitudes toward mandatory professional development & peer mentoring
39	72	adjunct availability for professional development sessions
40	72	attendance at off-campus conventions/ seminars
41	73	publications per year
42	75	enjoyment of teaching
43	76	self-evaluation of teaching effectiveness
44	76	comparison with full-timers
45	78	academic preparation of students
46	80	text selection (can/ cannot & want to/ don't want to
47	81	disruptive students
48	82	letters of recommendation for students
49	84	fairness of salary
50	83	fairness of salary by taxonomy
51	85	percentage that might quit
52	86	reasons for quitting
53	87	actions adjuncts can take
54	88	supportive actions by full-timers

Table	Page	Subject
55	89	ways dept. could improve teaching for adjuncts
56	90	reasons adjuncts think administrators employ adjuncts
57	93	factors that hinder & enhance classroom teaching

WORKS CITED

Abel, Emily K. (1984). *Terminal degrees: The job crisis in higher education.* New York: CBS Educational and Professional Publishing.

Academe (1998). *Statement from the conference on the growing use of part-time and adjunct faculty* January-February, 1998 (pp. 54-60).

Adelman, Clifford (1997, April 15). Community colleges: Drop-in centers no more. *The Washington Post*, p. A19.

Adelman, Clifford (1999, January-February). Crosscurrents and riptides: Asking about the capacity of the higher education system. *Change*, pp. 21-27.

Almanac Issue (1998-1999). *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, XLV(1).

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (1988). *Building communities: A vision for a new century.* Washington, D.C.: 58 pp. (ERIC ED 293 578).

American Association of Higher Education (1995). *The Teaching Portfolio* (3rd ed.). Washington, D.C.

Anderson, M.S. & Louis, K.S. (1991). The changing locus of control over faculty research: from self-regulation to dispersed influence. In John C. Smart *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (vol. VII, 57-101). Bronx: Agathon Press.

Baker, George A. (1995). *Team building for quality: Transitions in the American community college.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community Colleges.

Blackburn, Robert T. & Lawrence, Janet H. (1995). *Faculty at work: Motivation, expectation, satisfaction.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Boileau, Don M. (1997). *Employing adjuncts and associate faculty: The good, the bad, and the ugly.* Chicago, IL: Paper presented at the 1997 Annual Convention of the National Communication Association.

Bok, Derek (1993). *The cost of talent.* New York: The Free Press.

Burke, Joseph C.; Modarresi, Shahpar; & Serban, Andreea (1999, November/December). Performance: Shouldn't it count for something in state budgeting? *Change* (p. 17).

Burns, Margie M. (1992). *Conference on college composition and communication: Newsletter of the part-time faculty forum*, (Spring, 1992).

Centra, John A. (1989). Faculty evaluation and faculty development in higher education. In John C. Smart *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (vol. X, pp. 155-179). Bronx: Agathon Press.

Chronicle of Higher Education (1998, March 13,). Employment in colleges and universities (A16)

Chronicle of Higher Education (1998, January 16). More freshman than ever disengaged from their studies (A37).

Cohen, Arthur M., & Brawer, Florence B. (1996). *The American community college* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cooper, Pamela J. (1995). *Communication for the classroom teacher* (5th ed.) Scottsdale: Gorsuch Scarisbrick.

Cornesky, Robert A. & Baker, Ronald (1990). *Using deming to improve quality in colleges and universities.* Edinboro University of Pennsylvania: Magna Publications.

Davis, L.D, Crawford, E.K., Cutright, M., Fry, J.E., Lie, R.W., & Trevor, T. (1997). In search of community: Faculty assessment of its presence at three institutions." *Community College Review*, 25(1), 3-14.

Dennison, J.D. (Ed.) (1995). *Challenge and opportunity: Canada's community colleges at the crossroads.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Eble, Kenneth E. (1988). *The craft of teaching* (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass: San Francisco.

Ellison, Ralph (1947). *Invisible man.* New York: Vintage International.

Erwin, J. & Andrews, H.A. (1993). State of part-time faculty services at community colleges in a nineteen-state region. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 17(6), 555-562.

Foot, Elizabeth (1996). Adjunct faculty at community colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 20(3), 203-207.

Gappa, Judith M. (1984). *Part-time faculty: Higher education at a crossroads.* Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Gappa, J.M. & Leslie, D.W. (1993). *The invisible faculty: Improving the status of part-timers in higher education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Garbarino, Joseph W. (1975). *Faculty bargaining: Change and conflict.* New York: McGraw Hill.

Gordon, David M. (1996). *Fat and mean: The corporate squeeze of working Americans and the myth of managerial "down-sizing."* New York: The Free Press.

Handbook for the faculty of Montgomery College: A reference manual for full-time and part-time faculty (1998).

Hemenway, D.A., Blaylock, A.W., Garies, R. S., Lanni, J. C., & Sherman, A. K. (1988). *Survey of part-time faculty members: Overview of results.* Rockville, MD: Montgomery College, Office of Planning and Institutional Research.

Henson, K.D. (1996). *Just a temp.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Hoffman, A.M. & Julius, D.J. (Eds). (1994). *Managing community and junior colleges: perspectives for the next century.* Washington: College and University Personnel Association.

Huffman, John (1997). *Adjuncts and their din of inequities: transforming complaints into action and results.* Chicago, IL: Paper presented at the 1997 Annual Convention of the Midwest Modern Language Assoc. (ERIC ED 417-646).

Kemerer, Frank R. & Valdridge, J. Victor (1975). *Unions on campus.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Kroll, Keith (1994). A profile and perspective of part-time two-year college English faculty. *Teaching English in the Two-Year College,* 23(4), 277-287.

Lasher, William F. & Greene, Deborah L. (1993). College and university budgeting: what do we know? What do we need to know? In John C. Smart *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research* (vol. IX, pp. 428-469)). Bronx: Agathon Press .

Magner, Denise (1999, April 16). Finding new paths for Ph.D.'s in the humanities. *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* (pp.16-17).

Mahaffey, Jean & Welsh, Michael F. (1993). Scholarship and the vitality of a community college faculty. *Community College Review ,* 21(1), (pp. 31-40).

McGrath, D. & Spear, M.B. (1991). *The academic crisis of the community college.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Mosby, Warren (1999). Adjunct faculty compensation study. *The Adjunct Advocate,* Nov./Dec. 1999, pp. 6-7.

Nelson, G. (Ed.). (1997). *Will teach for food.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Nespoli, Lawrence A. & Gilroy, Hollie A. (1998). Lobbying for funds. *Community College Journal,* 68(4), 10-14.

Norris, N.A. & Knowles, M. (Ed's.) (1989). *Community college futures: From rhetoric to reality.* Stillwater: New Forums Press.

Northern Virginia Community College *1996-97 Faculty handbook.*

Northern Virginia Community College Office of Institutional Research (1998). *Factbook, Fall 1993-1997.*

Paglia, Camille (1998, March 29). Ancients and moderns. *The Washington Post* (Book World Suppl., p. 8).

Restak, Richard (1999, August 29). The brain. *The Washington Post* (Book World Suppl., p. 8).

Roueche, John E. (1996). Leadership challenges for 2000. *Community College Journal,* 66(5), 12-13.

Roueche, John E., Roueche, Suanne D. & Milliron, Mark D. (1995). *Strangers in their own land.* Washington: Community College Press.

Schmidt, Peter (1998, May 8). 2-Year college leaders discuss political and economic shifts. *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* (pp. A 37-38).

Schultz, Daniel F. (1995). Why faculties bargain. In Richard J. Ernst (Ed.), *Adjusting to collective bargaining.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass (pp. 23-27).

Schuster, Jack H. (1998). Reconfiguring the professoriate: An overview. *Academe*, January-February, pp.48-53.

Seidman, E. (1985). *In the words of the faculty: Perspectives on improving teaching and educational quality in community colleges.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Seldin, Peter (1996). *The teaching portfolio* (2nd ed.). Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing.

Sloan (Alfred P.) Foundation (1998). *Part-time, adjunct, and temporary faculty: A new majority?* William and Mary College: David W. Leslie.

Smith, R.W. (1995). *Tomorrow's community college.* Princeton: Life Press.

Stollar, Louis, Hittelman, Martin, & Schermerhorn, Karen (1996). Statement on part-time faculty employment. *American Federation of Teachers higher education program and policy council task force on part-time faculty.* Washington, D.C.

Styne, Marlys M. (1997). Those unfamiliar names and faces: The hiring, management, and evaluation of part-time faculty. *Teaching English in the Two-Year College,* 24(1), 50-55.

Suro, Robert (1997, February 24). More spent building prisons than colleges. *The Washington Post* (p. A12).

Sydow, Debbie (1994). Current status of professional development among language and literature faculty in Virginia's community colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice,* 18(3), 229-244.

Will, George F. (1998, April 13). Disorder in the schools. *Time.*

Vaughan, G.B. (1995). *The community college story.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community Colleges.

Wallace, M. Elizabeth (Ed.) (1984). *Part-time academic employment in the humanities.* New York: Modern Language Association.

"What Was and What Will Be" (1996). Article in *Community College Journal* 66(5), 44.

Wilson, Robin (1998, July 24). For some adjunct faculty members, the tenure track holds little appeal. *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (pp. A9-10).

Working for renewal (1998). A kit for organizing on the issues of part-time and non-tenure-track faculty. American Association of University Professors: Washington, D.C.

CURRICULUM VITAE

John N. Huffman was born on November 21, 1937 in Washington, D.C. He was raised in Colorado, worked for the U.S. Senate, served in the Intelligence Corps of the U.S. Army in Heidelberg, and then worked in fund raising and public relations while raising a family in Oregon and Washington, D.C. In 1990 he followed a calling to become a teacher, earned a Bachelor of Science in Journalism from the University of Maryland in 1991, entered primary and secondary classrooms in the District of Columbia in 1992, and earned a Master in Science in Education from Johns Hopkins University in 1993. In 1994 he started teaching at the community college and university level, teaching undergraduate and graduate courses in ESL and communication. Currently he combines adjunct teaching with an entrepreneurial venture into English language services, which he plans to expand to Italy.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Perceptions by Community College Adjunct Instructors: Factors That Hinder and Enhance Their Classroom Teaching and Actions That Can Address Those Factors

Author(s): John Huffman

Corporate Source: 0

Publication Date: 3/20/2000

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☒

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here,→ please

Signature: John N Huffman

Printed Name/Position/Title: John N. HUFFMAN D.ARTS.

Organization/Address: 0

Telephone: 301-929-0000

FAX:

E-Mail Address: wordoc@jhu.edu

Date: 7/19/02

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC Clearinghouse for Community Colleges
3051 Moore Hall, UCLA
Box 951521
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1521

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2000)